School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1375655

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

BS
1938
R4

E. J. Palmer

THE REVISERS

AND

E GREEK TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

BY

TWO MEMBERS

OF

THE NEW TESTAMENT COMPANY

Westcott + Hort

London
MACMILLAN AND CO.
1882

OXFORD:
BY E. PICKARD HALL, M.A., AND J. H. STACY,
PRINTERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

THE REVISERS AND THE GREEK TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

A BOLD assault has been made in recent numbers of the Quarterly Review upon the whole fabric of criticism which has been built up during the last fifty years by the patient labour of successive editors of the Greek Testament. The subject of the articles to which we refer is the Revised Version; their undisguised purpose is to destroy the credit of that Version. The first article is entitled 'The New Greek Text,' the second 'The New English Version:' in both, however, textual questions are discussed, in the first textual questions only. By the 'New Greek Text' the Reviewer must be taken to mean the choice of readings made by the Revisers, as they did not construct, or undertake to construct, a continuous and complete Greek text. This 'New Greek Text' (for we will not insist on a verbal question) he pronounces 'entirely undeserving of confidence.' He assails with especial vehemence Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort, whom he represents as the chief guides of the Revisers in this department. He condemns in the strongest terms the edition of the Greek Testament[1] which was published last year by these two Professors:—a work, we

[1] The New Testament in the original Greek—the text revised by Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D., and Fenton John Anthony Hort, D.D. Cambridge and London: Macmillan and Co. 1881.

Methodist World Service Fund
Religion
A6256

must observe, wholly independent of the Revision in its inception and in its execution. He does not hesitate to stigmatise the text printed in that edition as 'a text demonstrably more remote from the Evangelic verity than any which has ever yet seen the light.' The Professors need no defender. An elaborate statement of their case is contained in the second volume of their Greek Testament, which was published before the Reviewer came into the field, although it appeared two or three months later than the first volume. The Reviewer censures their text: in neither article has he attempted a serious examination of the arguments which they allege in its support.

We do not intend to reply to these articles in detail. To follow the Reviewer through his criticisms, and to show how often they rest ultimately (whether aimed at the 'New Greek Text' or at the 'New English Version') upon the notion that it is little else than sacrilege to impugn the tradition of the last three hundred years, would be a weary and unprofitable task. There is something, moreover, in his tone which makes controversy with him difficult. Silence is the best reply to flouts and gibes. But the questions which are connected with the Greek text of the New Testament are so important, and lie so far out of the track of the ordinary reader, that we cannot allow the Reviewer's observations upon this subject to remain wholly unanswered.

First of all, we desire to call attention to the fact which we mentioned at the outset. The Reviewer's attack is not confined to positions occupied exclusively by the Revisers. His fire includes in its range a multitude of other scholars also. Some of these he censures by name; others he does not name at all, or names as though he believed them to share his

own opinions. A single illustration of this statement will suffice. The Reviewer has devoted five pages to the famous diversity of reading in 1 Tim. iii. 16. He employs his heaviest artillery against the reading (ὃς ἐφανερώθη) which the Revisers have adopted in this verse. It would be natural to suppose that here at all events the Revisers (with the two Cambridge Professors) stand alone. In point of fact, however, the same reading is found in the critical editions of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; it was adopted by the late Dean Alford in his Greek Testament; it was adopted by Bishop Ellicott in his Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, after a personal inspection of the Alexandrian manuscript; it was adopted by the Bishop of Lincoln (then Canon Wordsworth) in his Commentary; it was adopted again by the Bishop of London in a volume of the Speaker's Commentary which appeared last year. Nor is it matter of surprise that the Reviewer's projectiles should strike down friends and foes alike. While he denounces by name Lachmann and Tischendorf and Tregelles, and describes the ancient authorities which they deemed of most importance as 'a little handful of suspicious documents,' it would be difficult to find a recent English commentator of any considerable reputation who has not been influenced, more or less consistently, by one or other of these three editors, or by the evidence which they have brought forward.

We have called these articles an assault on the criticism of the last fifty years. We might call them without injustice an assault on two centuries of criticism. If the Reviewer is right, Mill and Bentley at the beginning of the eighteenth century (not to mention any of the critics who came after them) were in

pursuit of an *ignis fatuus.* Mill, the founder (so far as the Greek Testament is concerned) of textual criticism, did not construct a new text himself, but provided materials for the use of others. It was his hope, as he tells us[1] in his Prolegomena, that the large stock of evidence which he had accumulated and had placed at the foot of his pages would enable those who used his book to see without difficulty what was the genuine reading of the Sacred Text in almost every passage. Bentley proposed to construct a new Greek text which should be founded exclusively on the most ancient documents then accessible. The plan which he sketched was the very plan which Lachmann carried out in the present century with better materials than Bentley could have obtained. According to the Reviewer there was no room for such hopes or such an ambition. Mill and Bentley had in their hands a text—the *Textus Receptus* —which, though not absolutely perfect, needed at all events but little emendation.

Our concern, however, is not so much with the Reviewer as with his readers. The main task which we propose to ourselves is twofold:—first to supply accurate information, in a popular form, concerning the Greek text of the New Testament; secondly to establish, by means of the information so supplied, the soundness of the principles on which the Revisers have acted in their choice of readings, and by consequence the importance of the 'New Greek Text' (as the Reviewer calls it) of which the Revised Version is a translation. For a full and plain exhibition of this 'New Greek Text' we must refer our readers to the Greek Testaments edited for the University Presses

[1] Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. Novum Testamentum Studio et Labore Joannis Millii. Oxonii, MDCCVII. Prol. p. clxvii b.

by Archdeacon Palmer at Oxford[1] and Dr. Scrivener at Cambridge[2].

I. In reference to the first part of this task, it is absolutely necessary to begin with what is simple and easily understood, and thence to pass onward to the more difficult questions which will present themselves at each successive stage of our progress. Textual criticism, it must not be disguised, has become highly technical and intricate, and it is impossible for any one to discuss such a subject properly without a considerable amount of carefully-digested knowledge as to the facts and details which have been slowly and laboriously ascertained during the last fifty years.

1. We begin then with a broad question in which every intelligent Christian reader must needs feel himself especially interested. What is the nature and literary history of that Greek text which presumably underlies our Authorised Version, and which is popularly known by the name of the Received Text? What is that text, and whence was it derived? When this question has been answered, we will proceed to consider what, by the nature of the case, would seem to be its critical value, or, in other words, how near it may be considered to approach to the original documents traced, or dictated, by Evangelists and Apostles. Those original documents it will be convenient to designate by a single term: we will henceforth entitle them the Original Text or Sacred Autograph.

[1] Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. The Greek Testament with the Readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorised Version. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1881.

[2] The New Testament in the original Greek according to the Text followed in the Authorised Version, together with the Variations adopted in the Revised Version. Edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press by F. H. A. Scrivener, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., Prebendary of Exeter and Vicar of Hendon. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1881.

The Greek text which was used by the Translators of 1611 appears, almost certainly, to have been the fifth edition of Beza's Greek Testament, published in the year 1598. The variations from this edition which are to be traced in the Authorised Version are only about a hundred and ninety in all, and are, comparatively, of but little importance. The reader will find them set down in the Appendix to that edition of the Greek Testament which we have already mentioned as edited by Dr. Scrivener in 1881 for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press.

This fifth edition of Beza, which thus becomes our starting-point, may be considered, in common with the other editions of the same learned editor, to have been for the most part a reproduction of the third edition of the famous French printer Robert Estienne (Stephanus), which appeared in 1550, and which has been treated as the standard text of the Greek Testament in this country till very recent times. Both Stephanus and Beza had access to manuscripts, of which two or three at least[1] were of considerable critical value, but of these neither editor made any real or consistent use. The beautiful folio of 1550 at which we have now arrived exhibits indeed in its margin a regular collection of various readings, but they formed little more than the embroidery of a handsome page—though it was an embroidery which gave such offence to the doctors of the Sorbonne[2] that the great printer thought it convenient to leave his native city that same year, and to spend the remaining nine years of his honourable life in practical exile at Geneva.

[1] See Scrivener's Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, pp. 112, 124, 150 (ed. 2).

[2] See Nouvelle Biographie Générale (Art. Estienne), vol. v, p. 513.

This edition of Stephanus leads us another step backward to the fourth and best[1] edition of Erasmus, published in 1527; and this again to his first edition, published in 1516, which has the distinction of being the first published (though not the first printed[2]) edition of the New Testament in Greek.

On that edition, as the ultimate basis of the Received Text, the first parent of all the editions which were used by English Translators or Revisers in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, we may pause to make a few critical comments. It appeared in March 1516 from the printing-press of John Froben of Basle, little more than ten months from the time when Froben first proposed the undertaking to Erasmus. The manuscripts from which it was printed (two of which retain to this day the printer's marks and the corrections of the hurried[3] editor) have been all identified, and are all, we believe, with one exception, now to be found in the public library of Basle. The manuscripts principally used were as follows:—for the Gospels a manuscript of the fifteenth century, for the Acts and Epistles a manuscript of the thirteenth or fourteenth. For the Apocalypse, as is now well known, Erasmus had only a mutilated manuscript, said to be of the twelfth century, in which the text is so intermixed with the Commentary of Andrew of Cæsarea, that it would have been no matter

[1] The fifth and last edition, published in 1535, differs from the fourth, according to Mill, only in four places.

[2] The New Testament which is contained in the Complutensian Polyglott was printed in 1514, but not published till 1522.

[3] Wetstein (Prolegomena in N. T. p. 124) says, 'Quis ipsum eo adegit, ut festinaret?' He of course knew quite well that good John Froben and Erasmus had one great and common anxiety, to get their book out before the appearance of the splendid Complutensian edition.

of wonder if the representation of it in his first edition had been even worse than it actually was. This manuscript was rediscovered[1], twenty years ago, in the library of the Prince of Oettingen-Wallerstein, and has been identified beyond all reasonable doubt.

It is proper to add that Erasmus appears to have occasionally referred to two other manuscripts, one of which has been ascertained to be of considerable interest: this last, however, to quote the words of Dr. Scrivener[2], he 'but little used or valued.' The same learned and accurate writer describes[3] the manuscript on which Erasmus relied for the Gospels as 'an inferior manuscript.' Michaelis, he says, went so far as to express an opinion that the two Rhenish florins originally given for it by the monks of Basle were more than it was worth. Dr. Scrivener adds, however, that some at least of the worst errors which Erasmus made in his first edition cannot equitably be referred to this unsatisfactory document.

We have entered into these details, because we desire that the general reader should know fully the true pedigree of that printed text of the Greek Testament which has been in common use for the last three centuries. It will be observed that its documentary origin is not calculated to inspire any great confidence. Its parents, as we have seen, were two or three late manuscripts of little critical value, which accident seems to have brought into the hands of their first editor.

But we shall not do it full justice if we stop here. The text which these manuscripts substantially repre-

[1] Scrivener, Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, p. 245.
[2] Ibid. p. 165.
[3] Ibid.

sent has claims on our consideration which must not be passed over in silence. Those claims have been brought out by the most recent opponents of the Received Text more clearly and forcibly than by any of its defenders. The manuscripts which Erasmus used differ, for the most part, only in small and insignificant details from the bulk of the cursive manuscripts,—that is to say the manuscripts which are written in running hand and not in capital or (as they are technically called) uncial letters. The general character of their text is the same. By this observation the pedigree of the Received Text is carried up beyond the individual manuscripts used by Erasmus to a great body of manuscripts of which the earliest are assigned to the ninth century.

More than this: it may be traced back on good grounds to a still higher antiquity. What those grounds are we will state in the words of Dr. Hort[1] himself:—

'A glance at any tolerably complete *apparatus criticus* of the Acts or Pauline Epistles reveals the striking fact that an overwhelming proportion of the variants common to the great mass of cursive and late uncial Greek MSS are identical with the readings followed by Chrysostom (ob. 407) in the composition of his Homilies. The coincidence furnishes evidence as to place as well as time; for the whole of Chrysostom's life, the last ten years excepted, was spent at Antioch or in its neighbourhood. Little research is needed to show that this is no isolated phenomenon: the same testimony, subject to minor qualifications unimportant for the present purpose, is borne by the scattered

[1] Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Introduction, § 130, pp. 91 sqq.

quotations from these and other books of the New Testament found in his voluminous works generally, and in the fragments of his fellow-pupil Theodorus of Antioch and Mopsuestia, and in those of their teacher Diodorus of Antioch and Tarsus. The fundamental text of late extant Greek MSS generally is beyond all question identical with the dominant Antiochian or Græco-Syrian text of the second half of the fourth century.'

This remarkable statement completes the pedigree of the Received Text. That pedigree stretches back to a remote antiquity. The first ancestor of the Received Text was, as Dr. Hort is careful to remind us, at least contemporary with the oldest of our extant manuscripts, if not older than any one of them.

2. At this point a question suggests itself which we cannot refuse to consider. If the pedigree of the Received Text may be traced back to so early a period, does it not deserve the honour which is given to it by the Quarterly Reviewer? With him it is a standard by comparison with which all extant documents, however indisputable their antiquity, are measured. It is in his mind when he censures such documents for 'omissions,' 'additions,' 'substitutions,' and the like. He estimates[1] the comparative purity and impurity of manuscripts written in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries by the number of 'deflections from the Received Text' which may be found in each of them. Why should not we do the same?

One answer to this question is obvious. The high lineage of the Received Text does not establish its purity. According to all experience of transcription, corruptions must have come in at every step in its long

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 313.

pedigree. It is only in the general character of their text that the bulk of the cursive manuscripts agree with the Antiochian Fathers. It is only in general character that the Received Text agrees with the bulk of the cursive manuscripts. It was immediately derived, as we have seen, from inferior representatives of that class. It contains, moreover, false readings which the manuscripts from which it was printed do not justify. A notable instance is the insertion concerning the Three Heavenly Witnesses in the First Epistle of S. John, which is unknown to almost all Greek manuscripts, late or early.

But fatal as this answer would be to the contention that the Received Text deserves to be treated as a standard, it does not go to the bottom of the controversy with which we are concerned. We have another answer to give, and an answer of a very different character. If there were reason to suppose that the Received Text represented *verbatim et literatim* the text which was current at Antioch in the days of Chrysostom, it would still be impossible to regard it as a standard from which there was no appeal. The reason why this would be impossible may be stated briefly as follows. In the ancient documents which have come down to us,—amongst which, as is well known, are manuscripts written in the fourth century,—we possess evidence that other texts of the Greek Testament existed in the age of Chrysostom materially different from the text which he and the Antiochian writers generally employed. Moreover, a rigorous examination of extant documents shows that the Antiochian or (as we shall henceforth call it with Dr. Hort) the Syrian text did not represent an earlier tradition than those other texts, but was in fact of later origin than

the rest. We cannot accept it, therefore, as a final standard. There are materials in our hands which enable us to approach nearer to the Sacred Autograph than it would carry us.

3. We are aware, of course, that for the general reader this brief statement will require expansion and illustration. It will be necessary for us to give some account of the extant documents upon which all critics, to whatever school they may belong, depend for the ascertainment of the Greek text of the New Testament, and to indicate, in some sufficient manner, the nature of the examination to which these documents must be subjected, and the results to which such an examination will conduct the student. Our task will involve us at once in matters of detail: but it is a task from which we cannot shrink. We shall endeavour to be as brief and plain as the subject permits.

4. The documentary sources of the Greek Text are of three kinds [1]:—

(*a*) Manuscripts, uncial (or written in capital letters), and cursive (or written in running hand), of the whole or parts of the New Testament.

Of uncial manuscripts we have about ninety, nearly two-thirds of which are copies (whole or fragmentary) of the Gospels. Of cursive manuscripts we have nearly a thousand. In these estimates we take no account of Lectionaries or Service-books containing Lessons from Scripture, known to the learned as *Evangelisteria* and *Praxapostoli* [2].

With the exception of one lately-discovered manu-

[1] See Westcott and Hort, Introduction, §§ 97 sqq., pp. 73 sqq.

[2] For the description of the manuscripts enumerated below and in subsequent pages we must refer the reader to the current handbooks, and especially to Dr. Scrivener's full and accurate Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament.

script, all the more important uncials have been published in continuous texts. The various readings of the others may be found at the foot of the page in the Greek Testaments of Tischendorf and Tregelles. Two of these uncials (B and א) belong to the middle of the fourth century; four (A, C, and the fragments Q and T,) to the fifth century; eight (D, Σ, D_2, E_2, and the fragments N, P, R, Z,) to the sixth century; the remainder to the seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries,—those of the ninth and tenth centuries being nearly as numerous as those of all the foregoing centuries together.

The cursive manuscripts extend from the ninth century to the sixteenth. They are far less completely known than the uncials. According to Dr. Hort's computation, 'the full contents of about 150 cursives, besides Lectionaries, may be set down as practically known.' A much larger number have been more or less perfectly collated. The Reviewer expresses a desire, with which we heartily sympathise, to see still more work done in the same direction. But there is no reason to suppose that the labours of collators, although they should collate, as he desires, '500 more copies of the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles, and at least 100 of the ancient Lectionaries[1],' would disturb in any appreciable degree the conclusions of textual critics. We know already, from a tolerably large induction, that the bulk of the cursives represent upon the whole the Syrian text, while a small minority represent, more or less consistently, texts of an earlier character. If all the cursives were collated, it is in the highest degree improbable that the proportion would be reversed, although we might expect to obtain a few more wit-

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 305, p. 6.

nesses against the Syrian text. On the other hand, that text would gain nothing in point of authority by the addition of 500 newly collated cursive witnesses in its favour. Such a discovery would be no more than a further verification of a conclusion which is regarded by critics as established sufficiently already.

(*b*) Versions, i. e. early translations of the New Testament into different languages, of which the most important are the Latin, the Syriac, and the Egyptian. The Latin Version exists in two forms; the earliest, which can be traced back to the second century and bears usually the name of the Old Latin, and the later form which owes its existence to the revising labours of Jerome about A.D. 383 and is known as the Vulgate. The Syriac Version exists also in what may be called two forms[1], an earlier and a later. Of the earlier, or Old Syriac, we have, unfortunately, only an inadequate representation in the imperfect copy of the Gospels found by Dr. Cureton, and assigned to the fifth century; of the later, or Syriac Vulgate, we have the well-known Peshito (or 'Simple') Version, which bears indisputable traces of being a revision of the earlier (like the Latin Version of Jerome), and was executed probably in the latter part of the third or in the fourth century. The Egyptian Versions are three: the Memphitic, or Version of Lower Egypt, containing the whole of the New Testament; the Thebaic or Sahidic, or Version of Upper Egypt, of which only considerable fragments remain; and the Bashmuric, of which only about 330 verses from S. John's Gospel and the Epistles of S. Paul have as yet been discovered.

[1] In this popular sketch we do not notice either the Philoxenian Version or what is usually called the Jerusalem Syriac.

Beside these great Versions we have the Gothic Version, containing, with many gaps, the Gospels and the Epistles of S. Paul, and dating from the middle of the fourth century; the Armenian Version made early in the fifth century, but represented by manuscripts of late date, and in itself bearing some traces of having been accommodated to the Latin Vulgate; and the Æthiopic Version, dating, according to Professor Dillmann, from the fourth century, but, in its present forms, so confused and unequal, and represented by such late manuscripts, that it is practically of very little critical use.

(*c*) Quotations from the writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers, and especially comments made by them on differences of reading.

On the importance of this source of critical information it is hardly necessary to enlarge. The evidence, however, derived from these ancient writers requires to be carefully sifted before it is used; and this for two very sufficient reasons, which have been stated by Dr. Hort[1] with great clearness and cogency:—first, the tendency of transcribers to alter the text in conformity with some current text of the New Testament which was familiar to themselves; secondly, the loose way in which the writers themselves often refer to the Sacred Text, and the consequent difficulty of determining in each case whether we have direct quotation or only general allusion.

The Ante-Nicene Fathers are, obviously, of very great importance; but the only period which is adequately represented in the writings that have come down to us is, as Dr. Hort[2] notices, the period extending from A.D. 175 to A.D. 250. During that period we

[1] Westcott and Hort, Introduction, § 156, p. 110.
[2] Ib. § 158, p. 112.

have the remains of four eminent Greek writers, Irenæus, Hippolytus, Clement, and Origen. We have also, of the Latins, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Novatian. The Greek Fathers subsequent to Eusebius must plainly be deemed of secondary importance. The quotations in their works exhibit usually such a mixture of different textual traditions that their evidence for or against any reading stands at best on no higher level than the evidence of inferior manuscripts in the uncial class.

5. These then are the materials out of which the text of the Greek Testament has to be constructed; and these materials, as we have already said, furnish evidence of the existence of several distinct types or characters of text besides that type which we call Syrian. It is thought now that they are separable into four groups, each group disclosing a primary text of very great antiquity, to the existence and character of which all the members of the group bear in varying degrees their individual testimony. The process by which this vast mass of documents has been reduced to such simple and manageable dimensions has been going on almost from the very earliest days of sacred criticism. From the year 1716, at all events, when Bentley was corresponding with Wetstein, down to the year 1881, when the elaborately-constructed Text and exhaustive Critical Introduction of Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort were given to the world, the problem how to master and use properly the accumulating materials has been that which each generation of critics has been labouring to solve, and labouring (we may fearlessly say) with steadily increasing success. When we remember how Bentley's hints and prelusive suggestions of 1716 and 1720 were expanded by Bengel in

1734, recruited by the materials of Wetstein in 1751, developed and systematised by Griesbach in 1796, practically set forth by Lachmann in the text of his Greek Testament of 1831, and recognised, illustrated, and solidified by Lachmann's great successors Tischendorf and Tregelles in our own days, we may certainly feel that we have now reached firm critical ground, and that what were once surmises and theories have become acknowledged facts and verified and accepted principles.

6. The great contribution of our own times to this mastery over materials has been the clearer statement of the method of genealogy, and, by means of it, the corrected distribution of the great mass of documentary evidence which we have just placed in outline before the reader. For the full explanation of the method of genealogy we must refer the reader to the Introduction which we have mentioned as a special feature in the Greek Testament of Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort. That method, it will be observed, involves vast research, unwearied patience, and great critical sagacity, and will therefore find but little favour with those who adopt the easy method of making the Received Text a standard, or of using some favourite manuscript, or some supposed power of divining the Original Text, as the only necessary agents for correcting the Received Text in the few places where correction is admitted to be necessary. The broad principle of the method is by rigorous investigation of the documents, and close study of their relations to each other, to separate those which can by analysis be proved to owe their origin to some common exemplar, lost or extant; and to continue this process in reference to the ancestral exemplars, until the genealogical tree of transmission is

completed, and a point reached where the particular character of text which belongs to the whole family of documents can be traced no further. We have already given a rough illustration of this method in the pedigree of the Received Text, which we have found to stretch backward beyond the days of Chrysostom and to link that text to 'the dominant Antiochian or Græco-Syrian text of the second half of the fourth century.'

7. The application of this method has conducted Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort to the following results, all of which, let it be observed, rest upon a searching examination into the contents and character of existing documents, and a severe and rigorous induction from the facts which that examination has brought to light.

Largest[1] in bulk of all the groups, into which the documentary authorities for the text of the New Testament are separable, is a group which includes A (the *Codex Alexandrinus* of the British Museum) in the Gospels but not in other books of the New Testament, the later uncials, the mass of the cursives, the Versions of the fourth century and of later centuries, and the Antiochian writers of the fourth century. We might add perhaps, roughly, the majority of the post-Nicene Greek Fathers, although we find[2] in them, as Dr. Hort observes, 'infinitely varying combinations of all the ancient forms of text.' The authorities above mentioned present to us, in a more or less pure form, the text which Dr. Hort calls Syrian. He considers this text to have been the result of a deliberate recension. The sources from which it appears to have been derived are certain other texts, the existence of which is attested by the remainder of our

[1] See Westcott and Hort, Introduction, §§ 185–195, pp. 132 sqq.
[2] Ibid. §§ 193, 223, pp. 140, 161.

documentary authorities. We recognise in this Syrian text all the features of a studied combination of various elements,—in short, of an eclectic text. It is copious in matter, rich in connecting particles, smooth, lucid, and complete, but (as might be expected) deficient in vigour when compared with the texts out of which it was formed. This Syrian text, after a period of confusion during which different forms of text were often blended together in manuscript copies of Scripture and in the writings of the Fathers, obtained at last the supremacy. It became dominant at Antioch, and passed from Antioch to Constantinople. Once established there, it soon vindicated its claim to be the New Testament of the East. Under the form of the *Textus Receptus*, or Received Text, it has held for the last three hundred years almost undisputed sway in the West.

After the large group of documents which exhibit generally the Syrian text has been deducted from the sum total of the authorities, no great amount of critical material remains on our hands. The remainder admits, in consequence, of close and minute examination. And such an examination is well repaid. The importance of the material is as great as its bulk is small. A rigorous examination of it discloses, according to Dr. Hort, the presence of three early and comparatively independent texts, from which (as we have already said) the Syrian text appears to have been derived.

(*a*) The first[1] of these three texts has been called the Western text since the days of Griesbach. It obtained that name from the fact that it was most conspicuous in bilingual (Græco-Latin) manuscripts and

[1] See Westcott and Hort, Introduction, §§ 170–176, pp. 120 sqq.

in the Old Latin Version. But it seems to have been very widely diffused during the second and third centuries, as every ancient Version appears to have been influenced by it, though not all in the same degree. It may be traced back to the beginning of the second century. After the close of the third century its influence waned, and it disappeared rapidly in the East, although it lingered in the West awhile longer. The documentary authorities in which it is chiefly found are D of the Gospels and Acts (the *Codex Bezae* which is at Cambridge), D_2 and G_3 of S. Paul's Epistles, E_2 of the Acts (the Oxford *Codex Laudianus*, which exhibits it in a later and less pure form), a few cursives, the Old Syriac Version, some African and European forms of the Old Latin, the Gothic Version (in part), Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Hippolytus, Eusebius, and (to some extent) even Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Its chief characteristics are stated by Dr. Hort to be two in number:—first, a love of paraphrase, which leads to frequent changes of words, clauses, and sentences, when the meaning seems capable of being brought out with greater definiteness; and secondly, a tendency to interpolation from traditional sources, of which the passage at the beginning of the eighth chapter of S. John's Gospel concerning the woman taken in adultery is probably an example.

(*b*) To the second[1] of these three texts Dr. Hort gives the name of Alexandrian, which was employed by Griesbach[2] in a wider sense. This text does not possess equally striking characteristics with those which

[1] See Westcott and Hort, §§ 181–184, pp. 130 sqq.

[2] Griesbach distinguished only three texts (or, as he called them, recensions) in all; Constantinopolitan (which is identical with Dr. Hort's Syrian), Western, and Alexandrian.

belong to the Western text. 'There is no incorporation of matter extraneous to the canonical texts of the Bible, and no habitual or extreme license of paraphrase.' Its variations 'have more to do with language than matter, and are marked by an effort after correctness of phrase.' There are also traces, especially in the Gospels, of attempts to harmonise and to assimilate. 'The only documentary authorities attesting Alexandrian readings with any approach to constancy, and capable of being assigned to a definite locality, are quotations by Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, and occasionally other Alexandrian Fathers, and the two principal Egyptian Versions, especially that of Lower Egypt.' No extant Greek manuscript has an approximately unmixed Alexandrian text; but Alexandrian readings are recognised frequently in the Gospels of L, in the Acts of E_2, in the cursive manuscript 61, and in the Acts and Epistles of A.

(*c*) The third[1] of these texts is, for critical purposes, by far the most interesting and valuable. It is a text which appears to be free alike from Syrian, Western, and Alexandrian characteristics, and is therefore called Neutral by Dr. Hort. Strong evidence is produced for the existence of a text which deserves this name and character. If the evidence be admitted to be sufficient, it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the phenomenon. It has been brought to light by the only sure method which can be adopted in questions of such intricacy,—the minute examination of documents. What the documents are in which this text is to be found we will state in Dr. Hort's own words[2]: 'B very far exceeds all other documents in

[1] See Westcott and Hort, Introduction, §§ 177–180, pp. 126 sqq.

[2] Ibid. § 235, pp. 171 sq.

neutrality of text, being in fact always or nearly always neutral, with the exception of the Western element already[1] mentioned as virtually confined to the Pauline Epistles. At a long interval after B, but hardly a less interval before all other MSS, stands ℵ. Then come, approximately in the following order, smaller fragments being neglected, T of S. Luke and S. John, Ξ of S. Luke, L, 33, Δ (in S. Mark), C, Z of S. Matthew, R of S. Luke, Q, and P. It may be said, in general terms, that those documents, B and ℵ excepted, which have most Alexandrian readings have also most neutral readings. Thus among Versions by far the largest amount of attestation comes from the Memphitic and Thebaic; but much also from the Old and Jerusalem Syriac, and from the African Latin; and more or less from every Version. After the Gospels the number of documents shrinks greatly; but there is no marked change in the relations of the leading uncials to the neutral text, except that A now stands throughout near C. In Acts 61 comes not far below ℵ, 13 being also prominent, though in a much less degree, here and in the Catholic Epistles. The considerable Pre-Syrian element already[2] noticed as distinguishing a proportionally large number of cursives in this group of books includes many neutral readings. In some of the Catholic Epistles, as also in the subsequent books, an appreciable but varying element of the text of P_2 has the same character. For the Pauline Epistles there is little that can be definitely added to ℵBAC except 17 and P_2: the best marked neutral readings are due to the second hand of 67.'

As the whole question relating to this third, and (as

[1] See Westcott and Hort, Introduction, § 204, p. 150.
[2] Ibid. § 212, pp. 154 sq.

it is thought) most genuine form of the ancient text is of the greatest critical importance, and as we may have to allude hereafter, in some closing illustrations, to the documents which have been just enumerated, we have deemed it necessary to quote at full length the above technical list of authorities. It is to be observed, moreover, that the manuscripts which hold the place of honour in this list, especially B and ℵ (the *Codex Vaticanus* and *Codex Sinaiticus*), held the same place, for the most part, in the estimation of textual critics before the publication of Dr. Hort's treatise on grounds wholly independent of his theory. As we have already said, a description of the manuscripts which are represented, here or elsewhere in these pages, by letters or by Arabic numerals will be found in Dr. Scrivener's Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament.

8. Three reasons are given by Dr. Hort for the belief that the Syrian text is posterior in origin to those which he calls Western, Alexandrian, and Neutral. The matter is one of so much consequence that we will recapitulate them briefly.

The first reason appears to us almost sufficient to settle the question by itself. It is founded on the observation, to which we have already alluded, that the Syrian text presents numerous instances of readings which, according to all textual probability, must be considered to be combinations of earlier readings still extant. To illustrate this in detail would not be possible in an essay like the present. We must refer the reader to Dr. Hort's own pages. He will find there[1] abundant illustration of it in eight examples rigorously analysed, which seem to supply a proof, as positive as the subject admits, that Syrian readings are posterior

[1] Westcott and Hort, Introduction, §§ 132–151, pp. 93 sqq.

both to Western readings, and to other readings which may be properly described as Neutral.

The second reason adduced is almost equally cogent. It is based upon a close observation and a careful analysis [1] of Ante-Nicene patristic evidence. The testimony which these early writers supply is particularly striking. While they place before us from separate and in some cases widely distant countries examples of Western, Alexandrian, and Neutral readings, it appears to be certain that before the middle of the third century we have no historical traces of readings which can properly be entitled distinctively Syrian, that is to say of readings which are found in documents that exhibit pre-eminently the Syrian text, and are not found in documents that mainly present the other forms of text.

Yet a third reason is supplied by Internal Evidence, or, in other words, by considerations (to use Dr. Hort's language) of Intrinsic or of Transcriptional Probability. A reading is said to possess intrinsic probability when it seems on its intrinsic merits the likeliest of two or more various readings to have been the choice of the author; it is said to possess transcriptional probability when it seems the likeliest to have given occasion to the other reading or readings in competition with it according to the laws which are observed to govern transcribers in their aberrations. Here it is obvious that we enter at once into a very delicate and difficult domain of textual criticism, and can only draw our conclusions with the utmost circumspection and reserve. Still even here, if the truth-seeking reader will take the trouble carefully to note down what appear

[1] Westcott and Hort, Greek Testament, Introduction, §§ 152–162, pp. 107 sqq.

to be distinctively Syrian characteristics, as established by a long induction of instances, and, with this knowledge in his mind, will minutely compare readings that have these characteristics with readings of another type, in cases in which they come into competition, he will find that the claim of the Syrian readings to be considered the true and original readings will gradually melt away under the tests which we have just mentioned. 'Often,' says Dr. Hort[1], 'either the transcriptional or the intrinsic evidence is neutral or divided, and occasionally the two kinds of evidence appear to be in conflict. But there are, we believe, no instances where both are clearly in favour of the Syrian reading, and innumerable where both are clearly adverse to it.'

These three reasons taken together seem to us to make up an argument for the posteriority of the Syrian text which it is impossible to resist. The reasons are widely different in their character. Each in itself is strong; but when taken together they form a threefold cord of evidence which, we believe, will bear any amount of argumentative strain. Writers like the Reviewer may attempt to cut the cord by reckless and unverified assertions, but the knife has not yet been fabricated that can equitably separate any one of its strands. Till that is done all attempts to elevate the Syrian text into a standard, whether in the form of the *Textus Receptus* or in any other less adulterated form, will be found to be hopeless and impossible.

9. It will be remembered that the treatise which we have quoted so largely, we mean the Introduction to the Greek Testament of Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort, was not published until after the publication of the Revised Version. Nor was it at any time, we must ob-

[1] Westcott and Hort, Introduction, § 163, p. 116.

serve, privately communicated to the Revisers. It was impossible for the Revision Company, therefore, to pronounce (if it had been so inclined) a corporate opinion on its merits. In all that we have said of it we have been speaking for ourselves alone. It is right to add in this place that the Company never expressed an opinion on the value of the genealogical method itself, which was first employed in the last century by Bengel, and afterwards developed largely by Griesbach, although the world is indebted to Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort for a full display of its capabilities. Indeed the Company did not lay down for the government of its action any formal theory of textual criticism. It was impossible, however, to mistake the conviction upon which its textual decisions were based. It was a conviction common to all the great critical editors from Griesbach downwards, however variously they might state this or that argument in its favour. It was a conviction that the true text was not to be sought in the *Textus Receptus*, or in the bulk of the cursive manuscripts, or in the late uncials (with or without the support of the *Codex Alexandrinus*), or in the Fathers who lived after Chrysostom, or in Chrysostom himself and his contemporaries, but in the consentient testimony of the most ancient authorities. That this was the conviction of Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, is plain from the character of the texts which they gave to the world. Those texts show, beyond controversy, how far they were from regarding the Received Text as a standard, and how high a value they ascribed to the oldest Manuscripts, Versions, and Fathers. The consequence of this fundamental agreement is a close similarity in textual results. An overwhelming majority of the readings adopted by the

Revisers will be found to have been adopted before them by one or all of these three editors. A similar relation will be found to exist between the Revisers' choice of readings and the Greek text of Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort. The 'New Greek Text' (as the Reviewer calls it) is not based, as he seems to suppose, on the text of the two Cambridge Professors, nor on the text of any one of the three great editors who preceded them. Its similarity to all these four texts is the natural consequence of general agreement in respect of the authority to be ascribed to the several documents, or classes of documents, which make up the *apparatus criticus* of every editor of the Greek Testament.

II. We have thus completed the first part of our undertaking. We have endeavoured to supply the reader with a few broad outlines of textual criticism, so as to enable him to form a fair judgment on the question of the trustworthiness of the readings adopted by the Revisers. To this question we now more immediately address ourselves.

1. Before we enter into details it will be necesary to say a few words about the composition of the body which is responsible for the 'New Greek Text.'

The average number of those who were actually present each day that the Company met is stated in the Preface to the Revised Version to have been sixteen. If the records of the Company were examined they would show that among the most regular attendants were to be found most of those persons who were presumably best acquainted with the subject of textual criticism.

It is not for us to appraise our own qualifications or the qualifications of our colleagues for this or for any other part of the work. But thus much it may be right

to say. The number of living scholars in England who have connected their names with the study of the textual criticism of the New Testament is exceedingly small. Three of that exceedingly small number, Dr. Scrivener, Dr. Westcott, and Dr. Hort, were members of the Revision Company and constant in their attendance. There were other members of the Company who had for many years paid special attention to this subject; and some of these had given evidence of their familiarity with such questions in published commentaries upon parts of the New Testament. The rest had learned, at all events, in their several departments of study, one lesson of primary importance, often reiterated but often forgotten, *ponderari debere testes, non numerari.*

Further, it must be remembered, that the results at which the Company arrived were communicated in due course to the American Committee, on which there were some textual critics of known eminence, and that the places in which hat Committee has desired to put on record a difference in judgment from the English Revisers in regard of the Greek text are singularly few and unimportant.

Two more points deserve notice in this connexion.

First, the largeness of the Company,—though it might at first sight seem unfavourable to the preservation of uniformity in the special work of textual criticism, —had at least one great advantage. The fancies and predilections of individuals were not able to usurp the place of evidence. The disturbing element which subjective criticism has introduced into questions relating to the text of the Greek Testament is not confined to the writings of the Reviewer. Even in editions of great value, like those of Tischendorf, the bias, not

wholly unnatural, in favour of a newly-discovered manuscript is to be traced with unmistakeable clearness. From such an influence the Company, by its very constitution, was to a great extent free.

Secondly, there were no corporate prejudices or preconceptions in favour of any particular school of criticism, or any particular edition of the text. The composition of the Revision Company precluded such a danger. Oxford, Cambridge, London, Dublin, the Scottish Universities, were all represented. Heads of Nonconformist Colleges were combined with University Professors, Bishops, Deans, and Archdeacons. The Reviewer often speaks as if Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort were responsible for all the results at which the Revisers arrived. This is absolutely contrary to the facts of the case. These eminent critics did indeed place instalments of their Greek Text in the hands of each member of the Company, in the manner that Dr. Hort specifies[1]. By doing this, however, they sought to help, not to direct the Company. Their kindness enabled their colleagues to see the readings which they preferred in full connexion with their context, and thus to form a better opinion concerning them than it is possible to form of readings which are suggested only to the mental eye by critical notes at the foot of a page. The passages in which the Company arrived at different results from those that are to be found in the edition of Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort are by no means few, and would suffice in themselves to prove (if proof were necessary) the complete independence of the Revisers in their final determination of the Greek text.

2. We pass next to a subject of more importance, perhaps, to ourselves than to the generality of our

[1] Westcott and Hort, Introduction, § 22, p. 18.

readers. We have spoken of the composition of the Revising body, and of their general qualification for the textual part of their work. We desire now to speak of the rule under which this part of the work was to be done, and the manner in which that rule was carried out in practice.

And here, at the very outset, let it be said that nothing can be more unjust on the part of the Reviewer than to suggest, as he has suggested in more than one passage, that the Revisers exceeded their instructions in the course which they adopted with regard to the Greek text. On the contrary, as we shall show, they adhered most closely to those instructions, and did neither more nor less than they were required to do,—unless it is to be brought as a charge against them that they suffered the University Presses to decide on the most convenient mode of placing before the public their deviations from the text presumed to underlie the Authorised Version, and did not insist upon encumbering the margin of the Revised Version with them.

But let us turn to the rule. It is simply as follows: 'That the text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating; and that, when the text so adopted differs from that from which the Authorised Version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin.' Of the second portion of this rule we have already spoken sufficiently. Practical convenience forbade literal compliance with it. Our real concern is with the first portion of it, which prescribes 'that the text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating.'

What can these words possibly mean except that which the Revisers state in their Preface that they understood them to mean? Nothing, surely, can have

been intended by them but that the Revisers were to follow the weight of evidence and not to hold themselves bound by any printed text whatever. By the nature of the case, as we have shown in the earlier part of this essay, the Revisers had before them the text of Beza, since it is his text, practically, which underlies the Authorised Version; but it was not suggested in the rule that they were to pay to this text any critical deference. Our point will be made still more clear if we bring into comparison with the rule of which we are speaking another rule which concerns the amendment of the English translation. There the Revisers are bidden 'to introduce into the Text of the Authorised Version as few alterations as possible consistently with faithfulness.' In respect of the Greek text they are bidden 'to adopt that text for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating.' In the first case a standard text is mentioned, which is to be preserved, so far as possible, unaltered: in the second case there is no hint of a standard already existing; the Revisers are simply bidden to adopt such a text as the preponderance of evidence may require.

Evidence for texts is of two kinds; internal and documentary. Under this rule it was the plain duty of the Revisers to attend to both. They had to determine in each case, as it came before them, on which side the evidence decidedly preponderated. We need not, however, speak here of internal evidence. Great as its importance is, especially in estimating the value of documents, its use, when there is occasion to decide between two or more competing readings, is rather subsidiary than primary. Moreover the difficulties which beset its employment in relation to the text of all authors whatsoever are multiplied indefinitely when

the text of Scripture is in question. Documentary evidence claimed, of necessity, the chief attention of the Revisers. How were they to determine on which side it preponderated? They all knew, as we said above, that this was no mere arithmetical problem. It could not be settled by counting the Manuscripts or Versions or Fathers which were to be found on this side or on that. The history and characteristics of the authorities which might be alleged were of more importance than their number. We have said already that the genealogical method, which has been so fruitful in the hands of Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort, was never formally adopted by the Revisers as a Company. But on the other hand the facts, on which that method rests, were continually before the Company, and had a great effect on its decisions. We mean such facts as the observed alliances of authorities mutually independent,—the frequently recurring convergence or divergence of witnesses that occupy representative positions in regard of the earliest texts,—the plain traces of a common origin in the case of the greater number of the later uncials and the large mass of the cursive manuscripts. All these phenomena were present to the minds of the Revisers, and they produced deep and lasting impressions, and led to final adjudications which it will be found easier to rail at than to disprove.

And this examination of textual evidence extended, in common with the rest of the Revisers' work, over eleven years. It is true that the questions which concerned the Greek text were decided for the most part at the First Revision: but they were often reopened at the Second Revision, and the critical experience that had been slowly and surely won was tested by the requirement of a majority of two-thirds to sustain

decisions which at the First Revision had been carried by a simple majority.

Moreover, the course of the work led the Revisers, naturally, to look further than the settlement of a Greek text which should be represented in the text of the Revised Version. Again and again it was found indispensable to notice in the margin readings that rested on evidence hardly inferior to that which supported the readings adopted or retained in the text. It was felt that, if this course were not followed, the state of the evidence would not be placed honestly before the reader. There were three principal cases in which the presence of such marginal notes appeared to be necessary. First when the text which seemed to underlie the Authorised Version was condemned by a decided preponderance of evidence, but yet was ancient in its character, and belonged to an early line of transmission. Secondly, when there were such clear tokens of corruption in the reading on which the Authorised Version was based, or such a consent of authority against it, that no one could seriously advocate its retention, but it was not equally clear which of two other competing readings had the best claim to occupy the vacant place. In such a case there was not in truth decidedly preponderant evidence, except against the text of Beza, and some notice of this fact seemed to be required by critical equity. The third and last case was when the text which was represented in the Authorised Version was retained because the competing reading had not decidedly preponderant evidence (though the balance of evidence was in its favour), and so could not, under the rule, be admitted. In such a case again critical equity required a notice of the facts in the margin.

This is the history of the marginal annotations which give so much umbrage to the Reviewer. He seems to forget that like annotations are to be found in the margin of the Authorised Version of 1611, although the poverty of the *apparatus criticus* which was then accessible to scholars and the undeveloped state of textual criticism made them comparatively few in number. Dr. Scrivener[1] has counted sixty-seven marginal annotations which relate to Various Readings in the Old Testament, a hundred and fifty-four in the Apocrypha, and thirty-five in the New Testament—besides others which were added without known authority subsequent to 1611. But we do not care to rest upon precedent. The annotations for which the Reviewer cannot find sufficiently hard names are in reality guarantees of the honesty and completeness of the work. They are not intended, of course, for uneducated readers, nor will an uneducated reader concern himself with them. To educated readers they will show that the Revisers were aware of the facts relative to the Greek text which are recorded in critical editions of the Greek Testament, that they did not fail to consider these facts themselves, and did not desire to conceal their existence from others.

4. On the exact mode of procedure at the meetings of the Company it is not necessary for us to enlarge. It has been correctly described by Principal Newth in his 'Lectures on Bible Revision.' The Reviewer cites this description, and takes exception to the fact that the members who were present at each meeting were called upon 'to decide at a moment's notice' upon the critical questions submitted to them. This is not, we

[1] Cambridge Paragraph Bible, edited by F. H. Scrivener, M.A., L.L.D., Cambridge, at the University Press, 1873, Introduction, Sect. ii.

must observe, Dr. Newth's description of the process. 'After discussion,' he says, 'the vote of the Company is taken, and the proposed reading accepted or rejected.' But we will suppose (for argument's sake) the discussion to have been often brief. Our readers will remember what we have said already about the composition of the Company. For many of its members the particular questions raised on such occasions had no novelty. Their own studies had made those questions long familiar to them. Nor did those of whom this could not be said fail to prepare themselves beforehand to the best of their power for this as for other parts of their work. It should be added that readings of importance were often reserved for consideration on a future day on which by special notice a full attendance could be secured.

III. We may now finally pass to a few critical details by means of which the trustworthiness of the Greek text adopted by the Revisers will be more completely substantiated.

It may be best first to examine two continuous portions, in order to illustrate the amount of the critical changes that have been introduced, and the coincidence of these changes with the results arrived at by the best critical editors of our own times. In the second place we may consider, more in detail, the chief passages which have been selected by the Reviewer as examples of a choice of readings whereby the true text has been perverted or obliterated. This would seem to be a fair way of meeting the charges that have been urged, not without vehemence, against the readings adopted by the Revisers. When the work has been tested in these two ways, its general quality will be brought clearly out, and the justice or injustice

of the criticisms that have been passed upon it will be distinctly recognised.

1. The two continuous passages which we have chosen for our consideration are the Sermon on the Mount as set forth by S. Matthew, and the First Epistle of S. Paul to Timothy. In the former portion of Scripture the documentary authorities available for settling the text are numerous; in the latter they are limited in number. In the former portion the venerable manuscript on which the Revisers have been charged with placing an undue reliance—the *Codex Vaticanus* known as B—is present; in the latter it is absent. We appear therefore to have two portions sufficiently different in respect of documentary attestation to supply fair samples of the Greek text adopted by the Revisers.

In the portion from S. Matthew there are a hundred and eleven verses. In these verses the Revisers have changed the Greek text from which the Authorised Version was made in forty-four places. If we examine these readings, and compare them with the readings adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, we find that in thirty-eight out of the forty-four places the reading of the Revisers is identical with that of the three eminent critics just mentioned; and that in the remaining six places the Revisers are in accordance with two out of the three critics with whom we are comparing them. There is thus in these one hundred and eleven verses not a single instance of any change peculiar to the text adopted by the Revisers.

Let us now turn to the other portion which we have selected. The First Epistle to Timothy contains as nearly as possible the same number of verses, and presents about the same number of changes. There are,

in all, a hundred and thirteen verses, and the changes introduced by the Revisers in the text from which the Authorised Version was made are forty-eight. Of these forty-eight changes, as many as forty-one are found to have been adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles: and of the remaining seven there are two only (καὶ omitted after ὡσαύτως, ch. ii. 9, and τὸν omitted before Θεόν, ch. v. 5) which are not supported by two out of the three critics above mentioned. In the former of the two cases, Lachmann is with the Revisers,—Tregelles placing the καὶ in brackets; in the latter, Tischendorf is with the Revisers,—Lachmann placing the τὸν in brackets. In both cases, we would submit, the Revisers have decided rightly. In the first passage the combination of A and ℵ (not otherwise a strong combination) receives the support of the important cursive manuscript[1] numbered 17 (33 of the Gospels), and of the later (palimpsest) uncial P: in the second passage the union of CFG with P seems to be weighty as against the division existing among the remaining authorities.

The above examination must, we think, be accepted as a sufficient proof that the text of the Revisers is, in all essential features, the same as that text in which the best critical editors, during the past fifty years, are generally agreed; and that thus any attack made on the text of the Revisers is really an attack on the critical principles that have been carefully and laboriously established during this last half-century. What has been found true of these two passages, which have been taken without any carefully premeditated choice, would, we believe, be found true, upon the whole, of every two hundred and twenty-four verses throughout

[1] Scrivener, Introduction, pp. 169, 238.

the Greek Testament. What the Revisers have done has been simply this,—to decide the questions which came before them upon the evidence which the labours and diligence of the eminent critics whom we have named had accumulated, and on principles which had been established by their investigations and reasonings. Results so arrived at can certainly not be set aside by mere denunciation, nor indeed by anything else than a refutation of the principles of textual criticism which are accepted and recognised by the great majority of modern textual critics. We have no right, doubtless, to assume that these principles are infallible; but we have a right to claim that any one who summarily rejects them and contends that such a text as the Received Text needs but little emendation, and may be used without emendation as a standard, should confute the arguments and rebut the evidence on which the opposite conclusion has been founded. Strong expressions of individual opinion are not arguments.

2. We now proceed to notice some of the passages which the Reviewer has selected as containing readings, introduced by the Revisers, which call for especial condemnation. In thus turning however more particularly to the Reviewer, we feel it necessary to record, on three points, our deliberate protest against certain of his utterances. In the first place we protest against the Greek text adopted by the Revisers being represented as a text for which Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort are in any special way responsible. Such a representation is unjust alike to the Company and to the two eminent critics who have been mentioned. It is unjust to the Company because it implies that all the other members put themselves, in this most important portion of their labours, into the hands of two individuals

only, and did not attempt to examine and decide conscientiously for themselves. It is unjust to the two editors in question, because it makes them responsible for a text which is very frequently at variance with their own. Let a competent reader examine the Greek text as set forth in the Oxford edition of Archdeacon Palmer, and as edited by the two Cambridge Professors. He will find, we believe, if he looks through the whole volume, not more than sixty-four readings in the Greek text of the Revisers which are to be found in the text of Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort, and are not to be found in the Received Text or in the text of Lachmann or Tischendorf or Tregelles.

We have, secondly, to protest against the unqualified charges of textual corruption and depravation made against certain manuscripts, e. g. ℵBCL, which the majority of modern critics, after careful and minute investigation, have declared not only to be wholly undeserving of such charges, but, on the contrary, to exhibit a text of comparative purity. To attempt to sustain such charges by a rough comparison of these ancient authorities with the *Textus Receptus*, and to measure the degree of their depravation by the amount of their divergence from such a text as we have shown this Received Text really to be, is to trifle with the subject of sacred criticism. Nor is much more achieved by a computation of the number of places in which they differ among themselves. Without such differences they would lose the character of independent witnesses which they now possess. Until the depravation of these ancient manuscripts has been demonstrated in a manner more consistent with the recognised principles of criticism, such charges as those to which we allude must be regarded as expressions of passion or prejudice, and set aside by

every impartial reader as assertions for which no adequate evidence has yet been produced.

The third protest which we have to make is against the intrusion into purely critical and textual matters of the imputation of disregard for the religious feelings of others. Again and again we find the Reviewer asking with indignation why the faith of readers is to be disturbed by the statement of critical details which from his point of view it is wholly superfluous to notice. If the question is asked in good faith the answer is easy. The Revisers looked at the matter from a different point of view. In their eyes the first thing to be considered was absolute truthfulness in the setting forth of Holy Scripture. They believed this principle to lie at the root of the demand for a Revision. They felt themselves constrained by this principle to adopt the readings and insert the marginal notes which displease the Reviewer. Those readings and those notes are of course open to criticism: nor is criticism unwelcome to the Revisers. That against which they protest is not criticism: it is an appeal, conscious or unconscious, to the passions and prejudices of readers; it is the importation of *odium theologicum* into discussions from which it ought to be kept as far as possible away.

3. We now proceed to discuss briefly a few passages which the Reviewer appears to have singled out as containing readings especially deserving of censure. To deal with all the readings which he condemns is impossible on his own showing. 'The *Textus Receptus*,' he says[1], 'has been departed from by them' (the Revisers) 'far more than 5000 times, almost invariably *for the worse*.' We are forced, therefore, to make a

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 366.

selection. We select, deliberately, those examples on which the Reviewer appears to lay the greatest stress. If they are almost exclusively taken from the Gospels, the responsibility is with the Reviewer and not with us.

The first passage, in the order of the sacred volume, is S. Matthew i. 25, in which the Reviewer notes[1] that certain 'important words' have been 'surreptitiously withdrawn[2].' What are the words in question? They are the word τὸν before υἱόν, and the words αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον after it. Now, although we are told by the Reviewer that 'a whole torrent of Fathers attest the genuineness of the reading,'—in addition to the much more weighty evidence of C, and (with respect to τὸν πρωτότοκον) of D,—we cannot hesitate to express our agreement with Tischendorf and Tregelles who see in these words an interpolation, derived from S. Luke ii. 7. The same appears to have been the judgment of Lachmann. At any rate, he deemed it critically right to reject the words for which the Reviewer pleads. These words, be it observed, are unknown to ℵ and to B, to the important palimpsest fragment Z, to two good cursive manuscripts, 1 and 33, to some Old Latin documents (among which is the valuable *Codex Colbertinus*), to the Curetonian Syriac, and to the Memphitic Version,—save only that this last appears to have read not υἱόν, but τὸν υἱόν.

We have here our two oldest manuscripts (manuscripts on which, as we have already said, the vast

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 305, p. 5.

[2] An instructive contrast to this language may be found in Canon Cook's note in the Speaker's Commentary on this passage. It is as follows:—'*her firstborn.*] Or, "a son," so the two oldest MSS. and later critical editions.'

majority of critics set a high value) supported not only by another uncial and two cursive manuscripts, but by ancient Versions from Italy, Syria, and Egypt,—a fact which, though recorded in Tischendorf's notes, is passed over in silence by the Reviewer. If we consider the internal evidence, it may be said, perhaps, with truth that either reading is equally probable intrinsically. But the well-known tendency of transcribers to assimilate parallel passages makes it far more probable that S. Matthew was assimilated to S. Luke in the process of transcription than that so considerable a difference of expression between the two Evangelists was introduced by transcribers when it was not found in the Original Text. No impartial critic, we are persuaded, will doubt that the weight of evidence is decidedly in favour of the shorter reading. If this be so, our first example illustrates the weakness of the Reviewer's main position. A reading may, it seems, be supported by the bulk of the cursive manuscripts, and by some uncials of fair age and authority, and by 'a whole torrent' of post-Nicene Fathers, and yet be false.

We pass onward to S. Matthew xvii. 21. The omission of this verse is strongly condemned by the Reviewer[1]. Here it might be thought that the case for the Revisers was less clear than in the former instance. Lachmann retains the verse; Tregelles places it in brackets; Tischendorf alone of the three omits it entirely. But it must be remembered that here Lachmann and Tregelles were not acquainted with ℵ, the first hand of which omits the verse. They had only before them the presumption that it might have been an

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 357.

interpolation suggested by the common[1] reading of S. Mark ix. 29, and that documentary evidence for the omission which was then known. That evidence, indeed, was strong. It consisted of B, 33, two Old Latin manuscripts, the Curetonian Syriac, the Thebaic Version, and some manuscripts of the Memphitic, besides other authorities. When it was ascertained that the first hand of ℵ was on the same side, the majority of the Revisers rightly deemed that there was a decided preponderance of evidence in favour of the view that the verse was an interpolation. On the other hand, they seem to have been also right in considering this to be a case where a marginal annotation was equitably required.

The reader may profitably compare our statement of the evidence in this place and in S. Matthew i. 25, and observe how, in perfectly different passages, we find nearly the same ancient authorities agreeing in support of the better reading, while the great bulk of the cursives and the later uncials, though in both cases led by C and D, are found together on the side against which it is impossible to deny that there is internal evidence of distinctly appreciable weight.

One other omission, censured by the Reviewer[2], may be briefly noticed,—the omission of verse 11 in the eighteenth chapter of S. Matthew. Now here there is even less room for doubt than in the preceding cases. The three critical Editors are all agreed in rejecting this verse. The probability that it was an interpolation, derived from S. Luke xix. 10, or from some oral or written source, is certainly strong, and

[1] In Mark ix. 29 the first hand of ℵ, together with B and two other authorities, omits the words καὶ νηστείᾳ.

[2] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 358.

the authorities that reject the verse are of high character. Again we have the same weighty combination ℵB, and moreover the first hand of L, a late uncial of well-known value. The two cursives on which we have already seen some reason to rely, 1 (first hand) and 33, and a manuscript rich in various readings, though still imperfectly collated, 13, are on the same side. With them are the same two Old Latin manuscripts that we had before us in the last example, the Jerusalem Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, and the Æthiopic, and (apparently) the weighty testimony of Origen in his comments on the passage. On the other side there is D and the same aggregation of later uncials, except that in this case the valuable manuscript C is not, as in the two preceding examples, associated with them. There is a gap here in that unfortunately fragmentary palimpsest.

In this last example we have found for the first time L in conjunction with ℵB. It is, however, a frequent conjunction, and always deserves attention. Usually, as in this last case, one or two good cursive manuscripts and ancient Versions,—Latin, Syriac, Egyptian,—especially the Memphitic, will be found associated with these three uncials. The Reviewer is naturally hard upon this group, as it is in frequent conflict with the *Textus Receptus.* He calls it 'a little handful of authorities, of which nothing is known with certainty except that, when they concur exclusively, it is often demonstrably only to mislead.' We have already seen occasion to doubt the correctness of this dictum, and we shall see more as we proceed. Meantime we will only say that other critics think very differently from him. Dr. Scrivener, for example, in a passage to which we shall have occasion to refer

immediately, speaks of ℵBL and the Memphitic as 'first-rate authorities.'

We may now pass to a few instances from the Gospel of S. Mark.

The first case we have to notice is S. Mark vi. 20, where the Revisers rightly read ἠπόρει, noticing in the margin that many ancient authorities exhibit the reading ἐποίει. Now if ever there was a case[1] in which intrinsic probability was against a reading it is against ἐποίει here. What are the 'many things' that Herod did after he had heard S. John the Baptist? Meyer tells us that they were the many things which he heard from S. John, though how this can be elicited from the words we do not clearly see. That excellent commentator, however, had far too good a critical sense not to add[2] that the reading ἠπόρει, though (as he thought) only weakly attested, had the appearance of being the genuine reading. In this case again the Revisers have Tischendorf only on their side, and not Lachmann nor Tregelles; but it must be remembered, as we said in the last case, that these two critics had not the reading of ℵ before them. The four authorities on which the Revisers relied were ℵBL and the Memphitic Version, and the reader has probably already seen enough to lead him to doubt whether such authorities are to be summarily disposed of as 'all of bad character[3],' or whether such a reading

[1] So Dr. Scrivener in his Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, p. 505 sq. His estimate of the evidence in this case, external and internal, is very unlike that of the Reviewer. 'We do not hesitate,' he says, 'to receive a variation supported by only a few first-rate authorities, where internal evidence pleads so powerfully in its favour.'

[2] Meyer, Kommentar über das Neue Testament, *in loco* (ed. 4).

[3] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 345.

as that adopted by the Revisers deserves in any way the title of a 'fatal substitution.' If ℵB and L when conjoined with the Memphitic Version are of the weight which all critical scholars unanimously assign to them,—still more, if the union of ℵB alone is of the great critical importance assigned to it by recent critics [1],—we venture to think that it would not have been possible for the Revisers, consistently with faithfulness, to have retained the more than doubtful reading of the *Textus Receptus*.

Let us turn next to a passage in the same Evangelist a little further on, viz. ch. xi. 3, in which the Reviewer [2] seems to consider that the mere enumeration of authorities adverse to the reading of the Revisers renders any argument completely unnecessary. '*Quid plura?*' he asks. We will endeavour to answer his question.

For this purpose, however, we must ask the reader to look closely at the facts of the case. The verse ends in the *Textus Receptus* with the words ἀποστελεῖ ὧδε, in the Revisers' text with the words ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ὧδε. Even the Reviewer will not defend the Future ἀποστελεῖ. But on what authority have the Revisers added the word πάλιν? On the authority of ℵBL (a combination on which we have more than once already found reason to rely), supported in this instance by the first hand of C (although it places πάλιν before and not after ἀποστέλλει), by D, and by an important witness (at any rate in this Gospel) of which we have not hitherto made use, the *Codex Sangallensis*, known as Δ. Origen also is cited as quoting this passage

[1] See Westcott and Hort, Greek Testament, Introduction, §§ 287–303, pp. 212 sq.

[2] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 339.

twice with the word πάλιν. To this external evidence we must add two other considerations. First, transcriptional probability is distinctly in favour of the genuineness of πάλιν, because it is apparently superfluous, and therefore not likely to have been interpolated, but very likely to have been omitted by a transcriber who had a turn for correction. Secondly, it is impossible to be quite confident that in the case of all the Versions which are cited for the omission of πάλιν the word was really absent from the Greek manuscripts which the translators used. They may have simply omitted the word in translation, as we have said that Greek copyists may have omitted it in transcription, because it was in their judgment superfluous. It is not, of course, really superfluous. On the contrary, it is an example of that exactness of detail which has often been recognised as characteristic of S. Mark. Upon the whole, we cannot doubt that this adverb was improperly extruded, and that the Revisers were perfectly justified in recalling it, as Tischendorf and Tregelles had done before them.

Five verses lower down, in ch. xi. 8, the Reviewer avows frankly that he stands alone among critics. Here, he tells us[1], 'the calamitous circumstance is that the critics have all to a man fallen into the trap.'

Let us look at the place. The text of Beza, which seems to be followed in the Authorised Version, stands thus: πολλοὶ δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἔστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν· ἄλλοι δὲ στοιβάδας ἔκοπτον ἐκ τῶν δένδρων καὶ ἐστρώννυον εἰς τὴν ὁδόν. The Revisers have preferred to read, with Tischendorf and Tregelles, πολλοὶ δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἔστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν· ἄλλοι δὲ στιβάδας, κόψαντες ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν. There is a manifest gain of terseness and

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 341.

vigour at all events. Four changes have been made. Στιβάδας is adopted for στοιβάδας, κόψαντες for ἔκοπτον, ἀγρῶν for δένδρων, and the words καὶ ἐστρώννυον εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν are omitted. All four changes have the support of ℵBLΔ. Moreover στιβάδας has five other uncials in its favour, and three more practically support it (since D reads ἐστιβάδας, EG στειβάδας), while for στοιβάδας ACSVXΓ are alleged: κόψαντες has the support of Origen: ἀγρῶν is supported by Origen again (who seems to note it as a point of difference between S. Mark and the other Evangelists), by C, and by the Memphitic and Thebaic Versions: the omission of the last clause is supported by C, the Thebaic, and the Æthiopic Version. On the other side there is the usual aggregation of the later uncials and the cursive manuscripts: and they are supported throughout by A; in respect of στοιβάδας and ἔκοπτον by C; in respect of ἔκοπτον and δένδρων by D; and, generally, by a numerical majority of the Versions. So stands the documentary evidence. What is 'the trap' into which the critics are supposed to have fallen? The Reviewer imagines that S. Mark wrote στοιβάδας, that some copyist, who was perplexed by this 'unique word,' changed it into the familiar word στιβάδας, and then (finding himself confronted by a fresh difficulty) changed δένδρων into ἀγρῶν,—and finally made the other two changes to round off his work. This curious theory rests on two assumptions, (1) that S. Mark wrote στοιβάδας, and (2) that the words στοιβάδας and στιβάδας are 'distinct in sense as in origin.' We have already seen that there is an overwhelming preponderance of uncial evidence against στοιβάδας,—and this is a case in which no other evidence is of real importance. We may observe, however, that in Origen's references to this passage we find στοιβάδας in

one place and στιβάδας in another. We must now add that there is every reason to believe στοιβὰς and στιβὰς to be distinct neither in sense nor in origin. The fact is that στοιβὰς is only[1] known to Lexicographers (1) as a various reading for στιβὰς in this very place, and (2) as a word explained in the Lexicon of Zonaras. His gloss is as follows: Στοιβάς. ἡ στρωμνή· ἢ τρυφῆς θρύψις. παρὰ τὸ στοιβάζω. Its sense, then, according to our only authority, is a bed or mattress,—which is the usual sense of στιβὰς also. As for its origin, it is plainly derived from στείβω, as is also στιβάς. In short, if στοιβὰς is a real word at all, and not a mere figment due to the uncertain orthography of copyists, it is neither more nor less than a bye-form of στιβάς. But the second part of the Reviewer's theory is, to a certain extent, independent of the first. At all events others have thought before him that the word στιβάδας (or στοιβάδας—for nothing turns on the spelling) may have suggested the change of δένδρων into ἀγρῶν. Is this really probable? Στιβάς, no doubt, usually meant a couch or bed; sometimes a mattress, sometimes (as the Reviewer says) 'a *floor-bed* constructed of grass, rushes, straw, brushwood, leaves, &c.' Plato speaks of yew and myrtle branches as employed for this purpose (Rep. ii. 372 B, κατακλινέντες ἐπὶ στιβάδων ἐστρωμένων σμίλακί τε καὶ μυρρίναις[2]). In Hesychius and Suidas ῥάβδοι and δένδρων ἀκρεμόνες (shoots and twigs of trees) are mentioned among the materials of such a bed. This being so, we fail to see why any copyist should have been tempted to alter δένδρων into ἀγρῶν.

[1] See Stephani Thesaurus, ed. Dindorf, Paris 1848–1854 *in vocc.* Στιβάς, Στοιβάς.

[2] Cp. Walter Scott, Lady of the Lake, Canto I. xxxiii:—

'The hall was cleared—the stranger's bed
Was there of mountain heather spread.'

The difficulty lay in the use of *στιβάδας* for materials which were not intended on that particular occasion to serve for a bed, not in its use for materials derived from trees. The employment of *δένδρων* in the passage would lighten this difficulty and not aggravate it. Moreover it would go well with the word *κόψαντες*, and would tend to bring S. Mark into closer harmony with S. Matthew, who has *κλάδους ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων*, and S. John, who at an earlier point in the same narrative speaks of *τὰ βαΐα τῶν φοινίκων*. A transcriber, we are persuaded, was far more likely in this place to change *ἀγρῶν* into *δένδρων* than the reverse.

On the celebrated passage, S. Mark xvi. 9–20, to which the Reviewer has devoted several pages, we do not feel it necessary to say much, as the passage is retained by the Revisers, although it is separated from the foregoing verses by a small blank space. There is a critical note appended to it in accordance with the practice which the Revisers usually followed when ancient authorities differed to an extent that was deemed by them to require notice. These being the facts of the case, we protest very strongly against the language that has been used by the Reviewer[1]. He recognises 'the gravest blot of all' (that in his mind disfigure the Revised Version) in 'the marks of serious suspicion' which he finds 'set against the last twelve verses of S. Mark's Gospel.' What does this language mean? The textual facts, as in countless other passages, have been placed before the reader, because truth itself demanded it. Can the Reviewer be unwilling that any allusion should be made to the evidence against the genuineness of these verses,—evidence sufficient to convince Tischendorf? Was it really the duty

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 304, pp. 325 sqq.

of the Revisers, in his opinion, to suppress all reference to the existence of textual difficulties in such a passage as this?

All that the Revisers have done, we must repeat, is first by the form of their printed text to indicate their belief (a belief shared by Tregelles and almost every critic of eminence who has considered the passage) that there is a breach of continuity between the first eight verses of this chapter and the last twelve; and in the second place, to notice, as usual, in the margin facts of textual importance. We totally decline to enter with the Reviewer into topics and arguments irrelevant to the course adopted by the Revisers. We do not even feel it necessary to place before our readers the external evidence connected with this paragraph. A reader who desires to see it will find it set forth fully and clearly in the Appendix to Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort's Greek Testament (Notes on Select Readings, pp. 28–51),—and with it other arguments, general and transcriptional, which are of great importance in this passage.

We now turn to a few places in S. Luke's Gospel in which the Reviewer appears to consider that the Revisers have introduced especially censurable readings.

We begin with the well-known reading in ch. ii. 14, *ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας*,—a change which the Reviewer permits himself to designate 'a grievous perversion of the truth of Scripture[1],' though he must be aware that in so speaking he is censuring Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, and, we believe, the great majority of the best modern interpreters—not to mention the entire Latin Church from the earliest times. That there are difficulties in this reading, first from the obscurity of

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 328.

the expression, and secondly from the rhythmical inequality of the clauses (if the first be considered to end with Θεῷ), we frankly admit; but, as both of these difficulties become sensibly diminished by closer consideration, as the transcriptional probabilities are, to say the very least, in equipoise[1], and as the documentary evidence is strongly in favour of the genitive, we can hardly conceive it possible for the Revisers to have come to any other decision. If this be not a case in which the evidence is 'decidedly preponderating,' the cases where such evidence is to be found must indeed be few. For what is the external evidence? The first hand of ℵ, ABD, all the Latin Versions, the Gothic Version, the Latin of Irenæus and Origen, Hilary and all the Latin Fathers, and the Latin 'Gloria in excelsis,' —a combination of unusual strength, representing the convergence of different lines of textual tradition. To place in opposition to this 'every known copy of whatever sort[2],' excepting the great manuscripts above mentioned, is simply to fall back upon the old principle of number, and to set aside all the critical knowledge of our materials that has been laboriously acquired during the last fifty years.

In the next passage on which we have to comment, S. Luke ix. 55, it is hard to think that the Reviewer is serious when he censures the Revisers for omitting the ancient but indisputable interpolation after the words ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς. When he states that 'manuscripts, Versions, Fathers from the *second century*

[1] The probability that a copyist would change the last word of the clause into a nominative, so as to conform it to the terminal nominative of the preceding clause, is, to say the very least, quite as great as the probability that the last letter was mechanically assimilated to the last letter of the foregoing word. Add to this the natural tendency to simplify a difficult expression.

[2] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 329.

downwards (as Tischendorf admits) witness eloquently in its favour[1],' are we to understand that the Reviewer honestly believes the added words to have formed a part of the Sacred Autograph? If so, it must be on the ground of some power of divination which makes all appeal to documentary evidence idle and unnecessary. If however it is to be understood that we are still in the lower realm of textual criticism, then it must be enough to remind any candid and impartial reader that the authorities which reject the first clause of the interpolation are ℵABCLXΞ, six later uncials, several cursives, copies of the Old Latin and Vulgate, and copies of the Memphitic and Æthiopic Versions; and that, in the case of the second clause, D joins the foregoing band of witnesses.

It is almost unnecessary to add, except that the mention of Tischendorf's name by the Reviewer might possibly mislead, that this eminent critic, like Lachmann and Tregelles, retains no such interpolated words in his text. The words probably come from some early extraneous source, oral or written, but they certainly form no part of the Gospel according to S. Luke.

We pass onward to a striking passage in the next chapter, S. Luke x. 15, where in the solemn address of our Lord to the unhappy town in and around which so many of His miracles had been wrought, the Revisers, with Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, adopt the interrogative form of words, *μὴ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ*; Here the Reviewer, after noticing the authorities that have rightly led the above-mentioned critics and the Revisers to adopt the interrogative, permits himself to speak of them as 'a consensus of authorities which ought to be held fatal to any reading[1].'

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 338.

Against such misleading and prejudiced language we are constrained once more to protest. The authorities thus described are ℵBDLΞ, the Old Syriac, the Old Latin, the Memphitic, and the Æthiopic,—a combination representing convergent textual traditions of the greatest critical importance. Their consensus, instead of being fatal to any reading, has been seen to be, even in the few examples that have come before us in these pages, in a very high degree confirmatory of its genuineness and truth.

The next passage to which we may properly call attention is one of great importance and of singularly instructive critical interest,—the Lord's Prayer as found in S. Luke xi. 2–4. Here, as might be anticipated, the Reviewer[1] censures the Revisers for having adopted a form which differs considerably from that found in the Received Text, but which, we sincerely believe, the following considerations will abundantly justify.

To put the matter in a form as devoid of technicalities as the nature of the case will admit, let us suppose that we had a treatise on the subject of prayer, written just one hundred years before the probable date of our earliest manuscript of the Greek Testament, in the second part of which the forms of the Lord's Prayer as handed down to us by S. Matthew and by S. Luke were considered and compared. Let us further suppose that this treatise was written by one who had especially devoted himself to critical and textual studies, and was so keenly alive to the corruption of the text in his own days[2] that he had apparently made for himself what he

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 304, pp. 324 sq.

[2] See Redepenning's Origenes, Part II, pp. 182 sq., where the reader will find some useful comments on the labours of Origen in the cause of textual criticism.

deemed to be a truthful copy of the Greek Testament; and let us also assume that this supposed treatise was written at a time when the writer's powers were most fully matured[1], and after he had had an opportunity of acquainting himself with more than one leading type of the Sacred Text and so of forming on the subject a trustworthy judgment. Let us suppose all this, and ask ourselves whether express comments on the readings of the passage before us by such a writer and in such a treatise would not command our especial attention, and predispose us to accept the readings which he gave as the nearest approach to the Sacred Autograph that we could ever hope to attain.

Now we have such comments, such a treatise, and such a writer. In the treatise of Origen *De Oratione*[2] we have a comparison between the forms of the Lord's Prayer as handed down to us by S. Matthew and by S. Luke, and the express statement that the words *ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, and the two petitions *γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, and *ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ*, are not a part of the Prayer as found in the Gospel of S. Luke. With a statement of such unusual critical importance in our minds we turn at once to the general documentary evidence. And what do we find? In favour of the omission of the first words (*ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.*) are the important authorities ℵBL, the valuable cursive 1, (33 omits *ἡμῶν* but retains the rest), the Vulgate and Armenian[3] Versions. In favour of the omission of the first of the

[1] On the probable date of the treatise, see Redepenning, Origenes, Part II, p. 32, note.

[2] Vol. i, pp. 227–265 passim (ed. De la Rue). It may just be added that if the reader will carefully consider the last-quoted page he will hardly be able to doubt what gender Origen assigned to *τοῦ πονηροῦ*.

[3] This Version retains *ἡμῶν*.

two petitions (γενηθήτω κ.τ.λ.) we have BL, 1, the Vulgate, the valuable Old Latin manuscript called the *Codex Corbeiensis*, the Old (or Curetonian) Syriac and the Armenian Versions, and Augustine, in a reasoned passage in his *Enchiridion* (cap. cxvi). Here it will be observed that ℵ deserts the authorities with which it is usually associated; but its place is supplied by evidence scarcely less valuable. The second of the two petitions, which Origen more than once expressly mentions as not found in S. Luke (ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι κ.τ.λ.), is omitted by ℵBL, 1, and the Vulgate and Armenian Versions.

When this evidence is carefully considered there must, we think, be few impartial critics, and indeed few readers who have looked through the foregoing pages of this essay, who will not come to the conclusion that the Revisers were fully justified by their rule, even on external grounds alone, in rejecting, with Tischendorf and Tregelles, the words and clauses of which we have been speaking. We have hitherto said nothing about the internal evidence; but this, it is obvious, is here of great weight. The tendency to assimilate in the Lord's Prayer would have been, by the very nature of the case, so peculiarly strong, that we may well wonder that it was ever resisted.

We may notice two other passages in S. Luke, one of less and the other of greater importance, viz. ch. xxiii. 38 and 45, in both of which the reading adopted by the Revisers is censured by the Reviewer.

In the first passage the Reviewer[1] objects to the omission of the words γεγραμμένη and γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς καὶ Ῥωμαϊκοῖς καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς. Here perhaps something might be said for the reading ἐπιγεγραμμένη which

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 355.

is found in the texts of Lachmann and Tregelles, though the latter editor has enclosed it in brackets; but, when the divided state of the authorities is considered, and the fact that γεγραμμένην is found in the parallel passage of S. Matthew, and ἐπιγεγραμμένη in the parallel passage of S. Mark, and that in neither is there any difference of reading, the transcriptional probability (viz. that the reading was derived from the parallel passage) combined with the documentary evidence of ℵBL, the Memphitic and the Thebaic Versions, appears to constitute a clear preponderance of evidence in favour of the texts of Tischendorf and of the Revisers.

The omission of the words γράμμασιν κ.τ.λ. is still more clearly borne out. Though in this case ℵ deserts its usual associates, its place is supplied by the first hand of C, the Old Latin manuscript called the *Codex Vercellensis*, and the Old (or Curetonian) Syriac,—the remaining authorities being, as before, BL and the Memphitic and Thebaic Versions. When it is remembered that these words may very easily have been suggested by John xix. 20, and that there is some division among the authorities as to the words themselves, there can, we think, be little doubt that the Revisers were perfectly justified in rejecting them.

The reading in Luke xxiii. 45 is of greater interest and importance, as the words adopted by the Revisers, viz. τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος (instead of καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος), might seem to leave the Evangelist open to the charge of having attributed the darkness to an astronomical phenomenon (an eclipse of the sun) which could not by the nature of the case have then taken place. The Reviewer, in consequence, does not miss the opportunity of using some of his strongest language and of

denouncing as a 'gross fabrication[1]' a reading which, as we shall soon see, is supported by testimony that cannot possibly be set aside.

In the first place we emphatically deny that there is anything in the Greek word ἐκλείπειν when associated with the sun which involves necessarily the notion of an eclipse[2]. It is rightly observed by Dr. Hort[3] that the varied use of this verb in the Septuagint is enough to show that, when used by a Greek-speaking Jew, it might easily preserve, when applied to the sun, its original sense, and not become technical. There is also evidence that it was understood by some ancient writers to be so used in this place. Secondly, the great authority of Origen, who specially comments[4] upon these words, and considers that the change from the ordinary reading was due to enemies of the Church, is not only attenuated but almost set aside by his remark that the Evangelists made no mention here at all of the sun, and further by the fact that in other and contemporary portions of his works he certainly adopted the reading for which we are here contending. We may therefore not inequitably treat the testimony of Origen on this passage as inconclusive, save only to show that 'certain copies' known to him contained the reading τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος.

Let us now see what further external testimony can be adduced. This we find to be ℵB, the first hand of C, L (ℵ and L read ἐκλιπόντος), some Lectionaries, the Memphitic and the Thebaic Versions, and some later writers,—in itself very important evidence. When however we add to this the high transcriptional proba-

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 343. [2] Ibid. p. 344.
[3] Westcott and Hort, Appendix (Notes on Select Readings, p. 71).
[4] Here, unfortunately, we have Origen in the Latin translation only.

bility that words which, it is clear, had caused a difficulty in the very earliest times, would be changed into a known scriptural form of expression (comp. S. Matthew xxiv. 29, S. Mark xiii. 24) implying the same thing, and bringing the passage nearer to the σκότος of the parallels in S. Matthew and S. Mark, we can hardly doubt that we have here that decided preponderance of evidence which the Revisers were instructed to follow, and that the 'gross fabrication,' as the Reviewer has termed it, is really a portion of the Sacred Autograph.

Two or three other passages still remain to be mentioned. It will be observed that the vast preponderance of the passages selected by the Reviewer for censure are from the first three Gospels. It seems natural for us to follow his example. We think it enough, therefore, to notice S. John xiv. 4, Acts xviii. 7, and to conclude our essay, as he concluded his first article, with 1 Tim. iii. 16.

In S. John xiv. 4 the Reviewer censures the omission of the word καὶ before τὴν ὁδόν, and of the word οἴδατε after it[1]. The interpolated words are fairly supported, since AD, N[2], Δ, and the good cursives 1 and 69, together with the Vulgate, Syriac (Peshito and Harklean), Gothic, and Armenian Versions, contain them, as well as the later uncials, and the mass of the cursive manuscripts. A careful consideration, however, of the clause and of the context leads us at once to surmise that we may here recognise the enfeebling hand of some early interpolator, who broke up the vigorous sentence καὶ ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω οἴδατε τὴν ὁδὸν into

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 348.

[2] A very beautiful manuscript of the sixth century, of which fragments only remain. See Scrivener, Introduction, p. 126.

two clauses, answering to the two clauses in the ensuing question of the Apostle. Intrinsic probability is here certainly strong against the Received Text. But to trust to this without good documentary evidence would be utterly uncritical. This evidence, however, is by no means lacking. For the shorter reading we have ℵB, the first hand of C, L, Q (an important but fragmentary palimpsest of the fifth century), X, the good cursive 33, one Old Latin Version (*Codex Vercellensis*), the Memphitic and (apparently) the Æthiopic Versions. Here again we have the decided preponderance of evidence by which the Revisers were to be guided. This passage is a good instance of the imprudence of relying too confidently upon mere preponderance of numbers. It illustrates also the importance of intrinsic evidence when it is employed with proper caution.

In Acts xviii. 7 we have an interesting example of diversities of reading. It is a case in which the two leading authorities ultimately differ, though they are in harmony as regards the substance of the correction which has been adopted by the Revisers against the Received Text. The question relates to the name of the Corinthian Christian to whose house S. Paul went after the opposition on the part of the Jews to his earnest preaching in the synagogue. In the original text of B, in the corrected Greek text of the ancient bilingual manuscript D (*Codex Bezæ*), and in the Harklean Syriac, we have the reading Τιτίου Ἰούστου. In ℵ and in the very valuable manuscript E_2 (*Codex Laudianus*), and in the Vulgate, Memphitic, and Armenian Versions, we find Τίτου Ἰούστου. In the Syriac (Peshito) and the Thebaic Versions the second word Ἰούστου is dropped; while

in A, the second hand of B, the first hand of D, the later uncials HLP, the good cursive manuscripts 13 and 31, the Latin text of D, and the Æthiopic Version, followed by the *Textus Receptus*, the word Τίτου is omitted.

On carefully considering this division of authorities we can hardly doubt the decided preponderance of the evidence for the fact that this host of the Apostle bore two names. The evidence that the second of these two names was Justus is overwhelming. The Reviewer[1] urges that the first name simply arose from transcriptional error. It was formed, he thinks, by the τι of the ὀνόματι and the ἰου of Ἰούστου, but he does not tell us how it happened (as it must on this theory have happened) that the transcriber repeated not the τι only but also the initial ιου. Transcriptional evidence may be urged in the question between Τίτου and Τιτίου, but, so far as we can see, in the question between two names and one it cannot be urged without imputation of larger error than seems likely. We think therefore that the Revisers were perfectly right in deciding on two names. In the difficult choice and nicely-balanced evidence between Τίτου and Τιτίου we think they were right in adopting the former, though Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort adopt the latter: it appears more probable that the iota was mechanically inserted by a transcriber whose eye rested on the ιου of the Ἰούστου instead of the ου of the Τίτου than that it was dropped by way of a correction, because Titius was a well-known family name. The fact that the Syriac and Thebaic Versions represent Τίτου may also equitably be claimed in favour of the Revisers, although these Versions omit Ἰούστου.

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 336.

We submit, therefore, that here again the Reviewer has failed to substantiate his charge.

We come now to 1 Tim. iii. 16. From what has been said already[1] it might seem almost unnecessary for us to discuss this celebrated passage. As, however, the Reviewer has treated it at great length and has presented the evidence in a manner which we cannot allow to pass unquestioned, we feel that it may be well for us, for the sake of the general reader, to put forward once more the true facts of the case.

Three different readings are found in the extant documents: θεός, ὅς, and ὅ. In uncial manuscripts these readings are represented by ΘC̄, OC, and O respectively. Only nine uncials are extant which contain this verse. They are ℵ, A, and C, with which the reader is already familiar; and the following which contain the whole or a portion of S. Paul's Epistles[2], viz. D (*Codex Claromontanus*) of the sixth century; F (*Cod. Augiensis*), G (*Cod. Boernerianus*), K (*Cod. Mosquensis*), L (*Cod. Angelicus*), and P (*Cod. Porphyrianus*) of the ninth. D, F, and G are bilingual (Græco-Latin) manuscripts. F and G are very closely related[3] in respect of their Greek[4] text, and must be taken as the representatives of a single manuscript now lost. Of these nine uncials three only, KLP, support θεός. Five, ℵACFG, support ὅς. One, D, supports ὅ. On the other hand, all the cursive manuscripts which have been collated support θεός, except

[1] Page 3, supra.

[2] KLP contain also the Catholic Epistles, to which L adds a part of the Acts, P the Acts and the Apocalypse. Scrivener, Introduction, p. 150.

[3] Scrivener, Cod. Augiensis, Introduction, p. 8.

[4] The Latin Versions found in F and G are quite different. But in this place both exhibit *quod*.

17, 73, and 181, which give ὅς, and 37 (a fourteenth-century manuscript now at Leicester) which gives ὁ θεός.

Turning to the ancient Versions we find them almost unanimous against θεός. All the Latin, all the Syriac, all the Egyptian agree. The Gothic, Armenian, and Æthiopic Versions are on the same side. In all of them a relative pronoun is found, never the equivalent of θεός. The gender of this relative pronoun is neuter in the Latin Versions and some others: in others again it is indeterminate: in the Memphitic and Thebaic Versions it is distinctly masculine[1]. The Georgian and Slavonic Versions[2] stand alone for the reading θεός.

We turn next to the Fathers. For the reading θεὸς the Reviewer professes to call twelve witnesses, of whom the earliest belong to the latter part of the fourth century. We have examined his references carefully. Gregory of Nyssa[3], Didymus of Alexandria, Theodoret, and John Damascene (who died severally about 394, 396, 457, and 756 A.D.) seem unquestionably to have read θεός. Severus of Antioch (who died about 540 A.D.) is not unambiguous. The citations of the Reviewer from Gregory of Nazianzus are inconclusive. We pass over names brought in to swell the number,—such as Euthalius, for whom no reference is given; the second Macedonius, who is claimed on the

[1] In these Versions the usage of the language would have required the adoption of the feminine form, if the translators had wished to represent ὅ.

[2] Dr. Scrivener (Introduction, p. 271) places these Versions in 'the third rank' of importance. The Georgian Version is ascribed to the fifth century, the Slavonic was made (as is well known) in the ninth by Methodius the 'Apostle of Bohemia' and his brother Cyril.

[3] In the passage quoted by the Reviewer Gregory has ὁ θεός, like the cursive 37.

strength of a story to which we shall refer presently; an unknown interpolator[1] of Athanasius, and an equally unknown author[2] of a work falsely ascribed to the same Father. Two celebrated names remain, on which we must pause for a moment: Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria. We believe that Chrysostom read θεὸς in this place on the faith of his Homilies[3] on S. John and on this Epistle, to which the Reviewer does not refer us. The passage which he does allege[4] deserves to be placed before our readers in full as an illustration of the precarious character of patristic evidence.

Cyril's case is very different. The Reviewer alleges a passage[5] from that Father's work *De Recta Fide*, which would be inconclusive if it stood alone. It does not stand alone. Earlier in the same treatise our text is quoted twice on one page[6] in a manner which seems to show that Cyril had no other reading than ὃς ἐφανερώθη in his mind throughout this treatise. If he appears to quote the text with θεὸς elsewhere[7], this shows at the

[1] Athanasius, Opp. i. 796 (ed. 1698). The interpolation is found in one MS only, and there only in the margin.

[2] Athan. Opp. ii. 33. Here the Benedictine editor remarks that the author seems to have lived in the times of the Nestorian controversy, i.e. about 431 A.D. [A.D. 330 in the Review must be a misprint.]

[3] Chrys. Opp. ed. Montfaucon, viii. 85, xi. 606.

[4] i. 497. Τὸ δὲ θεὸν ὄντα ἄνθρωπον θελῆσαι γενέσθαι καὶ ἀνασχέσθαι καταβῆναι τοσοῦτον ὅσον οὐδὲ διάνοια δέξασθαι δύναται, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ φρικωδέστατον καὶ ἐκπλήξεως γέμον. ὃ δὴ καὶ Παῦλος θαυμάζων ἔλεγεν· καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστι τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον· ποῖον μέγα; θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί· καὶ πάλιν ἀλλαχοῦ· οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται ὁ θεός· ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται· ὅθεν ὤφειλε κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι. If this passage attests the reading θεὸς in 1 Tim. iii. 16, does it not also attest the reading ὁ θεὸς in Heb. iii. 16, where no copyist or translator has introduced it?

[5] Cyril. Alex. ed. Aubert. Opp. vol. v. part ii. p. 154. [6] Ibid. p. 6.

[7] E. g. De Incarnatione Domini, cap. 29, Nova Bibliotheca Patrum, Romæ 1844, ii. 68.

most the uncertainty of patristic evidence. But we cannot stop here. Wetstein observed long ago that Cyril does not produce this text, while he does produce Rom. ix. 5, in answer to the allegation which he quotes from Julian[1] that S. Paul never employed the word θεὸς of our Lord. And similarly, in a treatise[2] first published by Mai in 1844, where Cyril is concerned to show ὅτι οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ὁ Παῦλος ἐκήρυττε τὸν Χριστόν, he brings in evidence Rom. ix. 5, 2 Cor. iv. 5, and Tit. ii. 11 sqq., but not our text, although twice in the same context he quotes the First Epistle to Timothy. We believe that Cyril cannot safely be cited as an authority for the reading θεός.

For θεός, then, we have Gregory of Nyssa, Didymus, Chrysostom, and Theodoret, in the fourth and fifth centuries, besides later Greek writers. We may, perhaps, add Diodorus of Antioch and Tarsus (who died about 393 A.D.), on the faith of an extract in Cramer's Catena[3]. For ὃς we have Epiphanius[4], whose evidence stands the test of examination, and Theodorus[5] of Mopsuestia,—not to insist upon our right to claim Cyril on the ground which we have mentioned above. For ὅ, as might be expected, all the Latin Fathers who have occasion to quote the passage

[1] Cyril. contra Julian. lib. 10, Opp. ed. Aubert. vi. p. 327.

[2] Quod Maria sit Deipara, Nov. Bibl. Patr. ii. p. 85 sq.

[3] Cram. Cat. Ep. ad Romanos, p. 124.

[4] Adv. Hæreses, lib. iii. Opp. i. p. 894, ed. 1622.

[5] De Incarnatione, lib. 13, in Migne's Patrologia Græca, tom. 66, col. 988. We have here the Greek original of the passage which occurs twice over in Latin in the history of the Second Council of Constantinople. It is worthy of note that in the Acts of the Council itself we find *qui manifestatus est*, while in Pope Vigilius' *Constitutum* (which precedes the Acts) we find *quod manifestatum est*, though the context plainly requires the masculine. See Harduin, Concilia, tom. iii. pp. 32, 84 (Paris, 1714).

are witnesses. We will concede to the Reviewer that the occurrence of the words *Qui apparuit in carne justificatus est in spiritu* in Jerome's Commentary on Isaiah liii. 11 is inconclusive as to the gender of the relative pronoun in the Greek which he had then before him. Gelasius of Cyzicus, who lived in the fifth century and wrote a history of the Council of Nice, reports[1] Macarius of Jerusalem as quoting the text at that Council in the form ὃ ἐφανερώθη, and the same reading occurs in a homily by an unknown author appended to the works of Chrysostom. This is all the Greek patristic evidence which is alleged for ὅ. One quotation of our text remains to be noticed, which is remarkable as the only unmistakeable reference to it in an ante-Nicene writer. Origen[2] (as translated and abridged by Rufinus, who died A.D. 410) has the following words in his commentary on Rom. i. 5, *is qui Verbum caro factus apparuit positis in carne, sicut Apostolus dicit, quia manifestatus est in carne, justificatus in spiritu, apparuit Angelis.* It seems fair to infer that Origen did not read θεὸς in this place.

The result of this lengthened inquiry is that the Latin Fathers are entirely for ὅ, and seem to have one Greek bishop of the Nicene Council with them, while the Greek Fathers who lived at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century are divided between ὅς and θεός. The majority, however, of these Greek Fathers, and the mass, perhaps, of those who followed them, are in favour of θεός. We have still a remarkable fact to mention. It was the distinct belief of Latin writers as early as the sixth century

[1] Gelas. Cyzic. Comment. Actorum Nicæni Concilii, pars ii, cap. 24, p. 152 (Paris, 1590).

[2] Orig. Opp. iv. 465; ed. Benedict. 1759.

that the reading of this passage had been corrupted by the Greeks. Liberatus, a deacon at Carthage cir. 530 A.D., relates[1] that Macedonius, the second Constantinopolitan patriarch of that name, was deposed [cir. 511 A.D.] for falsifying this very passage. The present text of Liberatus says that Macedonius changed ὃς into ὡς. But Hincmar of Rheims, who repeats[2] the story at length in the ninth century, says expressly that he changed ὃς into θεός. The story shows, at all events, that the Latins in the sixth century believed ὃς to be the reading of the older Greek manuscripts, and regarded θεὸς as a false reading made out of it.

And now we will briefly sum up the evidence. Θεὸς rests exclusively on the testimony of three uncial manuscripts of the ninth century, the mass of the cursives (which are in this case nearly unanimous), and a majority of Greek Fathers from the end of the fourth century downwards. Ὃς is supported by five uncials, among which are the three oldest, three cursives, the two Egyptian Versions, and some Greek Fathers of importance. Ὃ rests on one uncial manuscript, the Latin Versions, and the Latin Fathers: but it has a considerable amount of support in other Versions also, though an amount which it is apparently difficult to determine with exactness. The testimony of the ancient Versions against θεὸς is in itself almost fatal to that reading. It seems inconceivable that it should be represented in none of them (except the Georgian and Slavonic) if it is genuine. And this consideration gains additional weight when we remember (1) that Jerome professedly corrected the Old Latin Versions by the help of ancient Greek manuscripts, and (2) that the

[1] Liberat. Breviarium, cap. 19, Paris 1675.
[2] Hincmar. Opp. tom. ii. p. 465, Paris 1645.

Latin Version was brought by his revision, and the Syriac by that revision to which the Peshito is believed to be due, into a degree of conformity with the Greek text that seems to be represented in Chrysostom's quotations, which was unknown to the Old Latin and Old Syriac. When we add to this testimony of the Versions the unanimity against the reading of our oldest uncials (for D is with ℵAC as against θεὸς) the evidence against θεὸς seems conclusive. When it is considered, moreover, that there is no clear indication of it in the Fathers before the latter part of the fourth century, that Athanasius, as his Benedictine editor observes [1], never used it in the controversy with the Arians, that Cyril (as we have already remarked) did not use it in his controversial writings on occasions on which it would have been especially important, and, finally, that the Greek Fathers who are distinctly shown to have employed it in the fourth and fifth centuries are, after all, few in number, it seems impossible to question the statement in the Margin of the Revised Version, that this reading 'rests on no sufficient evidence.'

It is a harder matter to decide between the claims of the other two readings. We will give briefly the grounds which seem to us to turn the scale. 1. OC will account for the reading $\overline{\text{ΘC}}$ more easily than O. Only the insertion [2] and superposition of horizontal lines was needed to effect this change. If O had been

[1] Athanas. Opp. ii. 33 (ed. 1698).

[2] In making such additions a copyist may have honestly thought that he was correcting an accidental defect in his exemplar, as was no doubt the case with those who gave its present appearance to the OC of the *Codex Alexandrinus* (see Mill *in loco*, and Wetstein, Prolegg. p. 22). Moreover theological expressions used by Greek Fathers may have been construed into authorities for such an emendation.

the primitive reading, he who added C must have felt that he was altering the text. 2. OC will account more easily for O than O for OC. No theological importance attached to this change either way. But the apparent difficulty of construction involved in the reading OC might easily have tempted a corrector to accommodate it in gender to the preceding word *μυστήριον*. 3. OC has a decided preponderance of manuscript evidence. Not only are ℵAC combined against D, but FG are on the same side; and all the manuscripts which read *θεός*, from KLP downwards, are witnesses in favour of the final consonant.

We have already examined at length the Reviewer's statement of the patristic evidence. With regard to the Versions his statement is fair, so far as *θεὸς* is concerned, unfair with respect to *ὅς*. 'The Versions,' he says[1], '—all but the Georgian and the Slavonic, which follow the Received Text—favour *ὃ* unquestionably.' We have already shown that this is not the case. But we are content to refer our readers to Tischendorf and Tregelles, who unhesitatingly claim the Memphitic and Thebaic for *ὅς*, and speak of some other Versions as more or less doubtful. With his treatment of the manuscript evidence, however, we cannot deal so briefly. He states[2] that the reading *ὃς* 'is not to be found in more than *two* copies (ℵ and 17) of S. Paul's Epistles.' He claims for *θεὸς* A, C, F, G, which are alleged by Tischendorf and Tregelles for *ὅς*. 'Of the three cursives usually cited for the same reading' (*ὅς*), 'the second,' he says, (i. e. 73) 'proves, on inquiry at Upsala, to be merely an abridgment of Œcumenius, who certainly read *θεός*; and the last' (181) 'is non-existent.' We might be content

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 362.
[2] Ibid. p. 364; cp. note 2, p. 362.

to demand whose word on such matters is entitled to most credit,—the word of the Reviewer or the word of the most famous manuscript collators of this century. But we prefer to go more fully into the matter.

First as regards the two cursives. Those who have had occasion to seek in public libraries for manuscripts which are not famous for antiquity or beauty or completeness know that the answer '*non est inventus*' is no conclusive reason for believing that the object of their quest has not been seen and collated in former years by those who profess to have actually seen and collated it. That 181 'is non-existent' must be considered unproven. In like manner the letter which the Reviewer seems to have received from Upsala is quite insufficient to dispose of the cursive numbered[1] 73. But this question is of comparatively small importance. We turn, therefore, to the four uncial manuscripts.

'A and C,' he says[2], 'exhibited $\overline{\Theta C}$ until ink, dirt, and the injurious use of chemicals obliterated what once was patent. It is too late, by full 150 years, to contend on the negative side of this question.' Some of his readers may be surprised to learn that, although beyond all controversy A and C have been made by later hands to exhibit $\overline{\Theta C}$ more or less plainly, there is no sufficient evidence that there was ever a time when this reading was 'patent' as the reading which came from their original scribes. On the contrary it was matter of dispute throughout the last century whether in either manuscript any marks were visible, *derived from the hand of the original scribe*, which indicated that θεὸς

[1] See Scrivener, Introduction, pp. 228, 239.
[2] Quarterly Review, No. 304, p. 362.

was intended. With regard to A, Mill, as he tells[1] us, thought at first that there were none; afterwards he seemed to himself to discover traces of such marks. And this was nearly a hundred and eighty years ago. Dr. Berriman, who wrote a Dissertation on the subject in 1741, agreed with Mill. Wetstein[2] inspected the manuscript in 1717, and saw no such traces. He re-examined it in 1747 with great care, after he had seen Berriman's Dissertation, and discovered the real nature of the 'traces' of which Mill and Berriman had spoken. When the leaf was held up separately, part of a letter written on the opposite side of it was seen through the parchment and appeared to belong to the O in question. Tischendorf, then, and Tregelles have not 'contended on the negative side of the question a hundred and fifty years too late.' They have but added their suffrages[3] to those of the best collators in the last century. We know not whether any scholar of repute in the present generation has differed from them, save Dr. Scrivener. The exception is important. We must refer the reader for his opinion on this point, and on the whole question, to his Introduction[4] to the Criticism of the New Testament.

With regard to C the Reviewer's language is still more surprising. That this manuscript was a palimpsest and contained portions of Holy Scripture under

[1] Nov. Test. Græc. *in loco.*

[2] Wetstein, Prolegg. in Nov. Test. pp. 20, 22.

[3] See especially Tischendorf, Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus, Prolegg. p. 42, note.

[4] Page 552 sqq. Dr. Scrivener states the manuscript evidence thus: 'All manuscripts (D *tertiâ manu*, KLP, some 200 cursives) read Θεὸς with the common text, except ℵ* A* (?) C* (?) FG. 17. 73. 181, which have ὃς, D* which (after the Latin Versions) has ὁ: the Leicester codex, 37, gives ὁ θς'.' [The asterisk denotes the *first hand* of the manuscript named.]

its later writing was first discovered by Peter Allix[1] about two hundred years ago. Wetstein, who was informed of the discovery by Allix himself, collated thoroughly in 1716 (for Bentley's projected edition) those parts of it which were concerned with the New Testament. He tells us himself that he went over it 'once and again' with care. Of course he employed his collation in his own New Testament of 1751. He pronounced[2] the original scribe to have written ὅς, and not θεός. A different opinion was expressed afterwards by Woide and Weber. Griesbach examined the question minutely, and agreed with Wetstein. In 1845 Tischendorf published at Leipsic a complete edition of those portions of both Testaments which were found in the palimpsest. He went into the question of this reading[3] at great length, and decided unhesitatingly that the original scribe wrote ὅς, and not θεός. If the Reviewer sets aside that verdict as pronounced 'too late,' we may fairly ask on what ground he sets aside the judgment which Wetstein pronounced more than a hundred and sixty years ago. But in truth the special qualifications of Tischendorf and his elaborate treatment of this difficult palimpsest give him a right to be heard[4] upon its readings to which no other critic can pretend.

Before we pass to the later manuscripts it is important to remark that ℵ and D also have been made by correctors to exhibit the reading θεός, although in these two cases the fact that the original scribes wrote ὃς and ὃ respectively is so clear that it is not disputed by the boldest champions of the Received Text.

[1] Wetstein, Prolegg. in Nov. Test. p. 27. [2] Nov. Test. *in loco.*
[3] Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus, Prolegg. 39 sqq.
[4] See Scrivener, Introduction, pp. 110, 553.

F and G are, of course, far less important than A and C, both because they belong to the ninth century instead of the fifth, and because they are copies of one manuscript. But they are of considerable interest, as they belong to the Western group of documents, of which the chief, D, exhibits ὅ. Both F and G exhibit $\overline{\text{OC}}$. On these manuscripts Dr. Scrivener has a special right to be heard. He published F (the *Codex Augiensis*) in 1859, and subjoined a careful collation of G from Matthæi's edition of that MS. 'There are no signs,' he says[1], 'of the ordinary breathings and accents in this manuscript. Codex F occasionally, and G more often, places a straight line *nearly* horizontal over the initial vowel of a word, which may be designed for the aspirate, but is found in some few places where the vowel takes the lenis. This mark is of some importance from the circumstance that both in F and G it is placed over OC in 1 Tim. iii. 16. Yet I do not believe that the line was intended to denote that $\overline{\text{OC}}$ was the familiar abbreviation for θεος, for not only is there not the faintest trace of such a line *within* the O as shall make it become Θ, but the line is placed *over* too many initial and aspirated omicrons to render it probable that anything more was intended here.' He gives a number of examples, among which we find ὁ represented twice in one verse (1 Tim. vi. 15) by $\overline{\text{O}}$ both in F and in G. The Reviewer sets aside the editor of the *Codex Augiensis* as boldly as he sets aside the editor of the *Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus*. He seems to think it enough to say that '*there is no single example of* ὅς *written* $\overline{\text{OC}}$ *in any part of either manuscript*,' i.e. either F or G. We will only add that Wetstein (at whose suggestion Bentley purchased the *Codex Au-*

[1] Codex Augiensis, Introduction, p. 27.

giensis), Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, and Tischendorf agree with Dr. Scrivener in this matter.

We have treated this reading at great length, but we have been compelled to do so by the Reviewer. He has made an elaborate effort to shake conclusions about which, we suppose, no professed scholar has any doubt whatever, but which an ordinary reader (and to such we address ourselves) might regard as still open to reconsideration. Moreover this case is of great importance as an example. It illustrates in a striking manner the complete isolation of the Reviewer's position. If he is right, all other critics are wrong;—wrong in their deciphering of manuscripts, wrong in their interpretation of Versions, wrong in their estimate of patristic testimonies, wrong in the textual conclusions which they found upon all these different kinds of evidence taken together. It illustrates also, no less strikingly, the central point of this essay: we mean the impossibility of trusting the mass of the cursive manuscripts, or of making the form of text with which Chrysostom was familiar—if that were now recoverable in its entirety—a final standard.

We now bring these remarks to a close. We trust that we have fully done what we undertook to do. We have endeavoured to give the general reader such outlines of a difficult and intricate subject as may enable him to judge for himself concerning the trustworthiness of the Greek text adopted by the Revisers. We believe that in our discussion of the examples which we have noticed we have done something towards disproving the sweeping charges of the Reviewer. In the choice of those examples we have followed his guidance. We have addressed ourselves to the consideration of those readings which he himself, so far as

we could judge from the vehemence of his language, seemed to regard as worthy of the greatest reprobation.

As to the completeness of our answer the reader must judge for himself. On two points, however, we desire to insist. First, if the Revisers are wrong in the principles which they have applied to the determination of the text, the principles on which the textual criticism of the last fifty years has been based are wrong also. Secondly, no equitable judgment can be passed on ancient documents until they are carefully studied, and closely compared with each other, and tested by a more scientific process than rough comparison with a text which (as these pages have shown concerning the Received Text) was uncritical and untrustworthy from its origin.

If we have established these two literary facts, we have substantially answered the Reviewer. We venture to hope that we have done something more than this. We hope that we have shown cause for the belief that the Revised Version does not rest on a foundation of sand, but on a Greek text which is consistent in its principles and pure in its general results. In times of controversy like that in which we live it is not enough that the vernacular New Testament should be 'a well of English undefiled:' it must represent with the utmost accuracy which is attainable the documents which were left behind by the Evangelists and the Apostles. It is true that the Articles of the Christian Faith do not depend on such variations of the Greek text as are in controversy between critics of different schools. The ancient manuscripts and the manuscripts of the Middle Ages, the printed editions of the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries, bear witness to

the same Gospel, to the same Creed. But nothing is insignificant which concerns the truth of Holy Scripture. There are grave interpolations in the Received Text which it would have been worth eleven years of toil to remove if nothing else had been done. There are innumerable blemishes and corruptions of less importance which have become known during the last century to all careful students. In great things alike and small it has been the desire of the Revisers to bring back the text to its original shape. They do not claim the title of discoverers. They have done little more than verify and register the most certain conclusions of modern textual criticism. In this as in other respects they have endeavoured to make knowledge which has hitherto been accessible only to the learned a part of the common heritage of Englishmen.

B 1010
W41

POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE the foregoing pages were in type, a third article has appeared in the Quarterly Review entitled 'Westcott and Hort's Textual Theory.' In this controversy it is not for us to interpose. The Revisers, as we have already stated, are not in any way responsible for the writings of their learned colleagues. For ourselves we will only say that our estimate of the importance of those writings remains unshaken. On the work for which the Revisers are responsible there is nothing substantially new in this third article. We observe the admission that there are 'known[1] textual errors' in the Received Text, the correction of which the Reviewer 'eagerly expected' from the Revisers, and that 'it cries aloud[2] for Revision in many of its subordinate details.' The Reviewer did not speak so plainly on this subject in his former articles: he was only careful to disclaim the belief that the Received Text is absolutely faultless. If we have attributed to him a greater veneration for it than he entertains, the general tone of his two first articles is our warrant. To those two articles—so far, at least, as they are concerned with the Greek text adopted by the Revisers—our essay is intended for an answer. We find nothing in the Reviewer's third article to require a further answer from us, or to make this present answer unnecessary.

[1] Quarterly Review, No. 306, p. 311.
[2] Ibid. p. 331.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California
A6252

BS1938 .R4
The Revisers and the Greek text of the

BS
1938
R4

The Revisers and the Greek text of the New Testament, by two members of the New Testament company. London, Macmillan, 1882. 78p. 23cm.

By B.F. Wescott and F.J.A. Hort?

1. Bible. N.T. Greek--Versions. I. Westcott, Brooke Foss, Bp. of Durham, 1825-1901. II. Hort, Fenton John Anthony, 1828-1892.

CCSC/mmb

A6252